Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World

Edited by
PAUL McKECHNIE
AND PHILIPPE GUILLAUME

MNEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTS HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

BRILL

Ptolemy II
Philadelphus and his World

Mnemosyne

Supplements

History and Archaeology
of Classical Antiquity

Edited by

Susan E. Alcock, Brown University
Thomas Harrison, Liverpool
Willem M. Jongman, Groningen
H.S. Versnel, Leiden

VOLUME 300

Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World

Edited by

Paul McKechnie and Philippe Guillaume

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his world / edited by Paul Mckechnie and Philippe Guillaume.
p. cm. -- (Mnemosyne supplements. History and archaeology of classical antiquity)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-17089-6 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Egypt--History--332-30 B.C. 2. Ptolemy II Philadelphus, King of Egypt. I. Mckechnie, Paul, 1957- II. Guillaume, Philippe. III. Title. IV. Series.

DT92.P7 2008
932'.021092--dc22
[B]

2008033695

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978 90 04 17089 6

Copyright 2008 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface ix
Contributors xiii
Abbreviations xv

Introduction 1
Paul McKechnie

ALPHA

A NEW MORNING OPENED ... IN THE LECTURE-ROOM

Ptolemaic Royal Patronage 9
Oswyn Murray

BETA

FROM ZEUS LET US BEGIN ...

Economic Reforms in the Mid-Reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus 27
Dorothy J. Thompson

The Foreign Policy of Ptolemy II 39
Céline Marquaille

A Re-Examination of the Chremonidean War 65
James L. O'Neil

The Unbalanced Relationship between Ptolemy II and Pyrrhus of Epirus 91
Geoff W. Adams

OGIS I 266: Kings and Contracts in the Hellenistic World 103
Matthew Trundle

GAMMA

COUNTLESS ARE THE LANDS … BUT NO LAND BRINGS FORTH SO MUCH AS LOW-LYING EGYPT

Egyptians in the Hellenic Woodpile: Were Hekataios of Abdera and Diodoros Sikeliotes Right to see Egypt in the Origins of Greece? 119
Martin Bernal

Elephants for Ptolemy II: Ptolemaic Policy in Nubia in the Third Century BC 135
Stanley M. Burstein

Piety and Diplomacy in Apollonius' *Argonautica* 149
Anatole Mori

Maresha in the Reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus 171
Amos Kloner

Herakleopolis Magna under Philadelphus 183
Erja Salmenkivi

DELTA

HOW HAS IT NOT OCCURRED TO ANY OF THE HISTORIANS OR POETS TO MAKE MENTION OF SUCH ENORMOUS ACHIEVEMENTS?

Ptolemy Philadelphus and Jewish Writings: Aristobulus and Pseudo-Aristeas as Examples of Alexandrian Jewish Approaches 193
Johann Cook

Sexuality and Ptolemy's Greek Bible: Genesis 1–3 in Translation: '… Things which they Altered for King Ptolemy' (Genesis Rabbah 8.11) 207
William R.G. Loader

Ptolemy Philadelphus: a New Moses 233
Paul McKechnie

Philadelphus' Alexandria as Cradle of Biblical Historiography 247
Philippe Guillaume

Gendering Healing both Human and Divine: the Case of Sirach 38:1–15 257
Elaine M. Wainwright

EPSILON

... AND WITH ZEUS MAKE END, YE MUSES

Innovations in Ancient Garb? Hieroglyphic Texts from the Time of Ptolemy Philadelphus 275
Joachim Friedrich Quack

The Problem of the Ptolemaic Sibling Marriage: a Case of Dynastic Acculturation? 291
Kostas Buraselis

Through a Woman's Eyes, and in a Woman's Voice: Ihweret as Focalizor in the *First Tale of Setne Khaemwas* 303
Steve Vinson

Bilistiche and the Prominence of Courtesans in the Ptolemaic Tradition 353
Daniel Ogden

The God Serapis, his Cult and the Beginnings of the Ruler Cult in Ptolemaic Egypt 387
Stefan Pfeiffer

Bibliography 409
General Index 455
Index of Passages Cited 475

PREFACE

Ptolemy II Philadelphus, king of Egypt from 282 BC to 246, has hardly received the scholarly attention which his importance in the history of the Hellenistic age would merit. A conventional claim, at the beginning of a book about Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and the conventional follow-up would be to say that we, the authors of this volume, have now done our part to rectify such an inexplicable lapse. But in this case the lapse is not inexplicable. Little quoted these days, the thundering rhetoric of W.W. Tarn is, I infer, still forming assumptions:[1]

> [Ptolemy Soter's] son, Ptolemy II Philadelphos, was of a very different nature. Alone of the kings of his time he was no warrior; his dealings with the war-god had consisted in putting two of his brothers to death in good Oriental fashion. The prince who presided over Egypt's age of gold was but a sickly creature, a devotee of pleasure in all its forms, ever seeking new pastimes and new sensations, whether among his mistresses, or in the gorgeous pleasure-fleet that he kept on the Nile, or in his menagerie of strange animals from far-off lands; one who exhausted every form of luxury, and who, prostrated by gout, envied the simple joys of the beggars beneath his window, even while he dabbled in search after the elixir that should make him immortal. Extremely able, nevertheless; a man of high culture; the first diplomat of his time; governing Egypt well, from the point of view of the Macedonian ruling caste, and amassing from it great treasures, as from a well-managed estate; distinguished above all by the encouragement which, following his father's example, he gave to learning, art, and science, whereby he has made his name famous. His own tastes seem to have been opposed to war, and the first ten years of his reign were uniformly pacific; secure in the command of the Aegean and the friendship of Sparta, there appeared to be no reason for his interference in Greece so long as Antigonos [Gonatas] sought no conquests there. In the years following 276 men may conceivably have begun to dream that peace, so long an exile, had returned to the world.

Our task in these pages includes, but also goes far beyond, saying that Philadelphus' kingdom was not altogether as Tarn imagined it.

In 2004 a conversation between Bridget Buxton and myself, which arose from the task of teaching a course on Egypt and the Hellenistic World, progressed to speculation over whether it would be possible

[1] W.W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford, 1913), 216–217.

to arrange a conference in which we would consider Egypt in the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, from the viewpoints of scholars across as wide a range of specialisms as possible. An interdisciplinary discussion, we believed, was vital. We shared a sense that still in our times studies, respectively, of the Greek and Egyptian worlds remain too much insulated from each other—and even within the classical domain, that Alexandria, as the home of Greek literature, and Alexandria, as the heart of the empire of the Ptolemies, too seldom appear in our scholarly literature to be one city. The Alexandria of biblical and Jewish studies might, to a superficial reader, seem like yet a third place.

The New Zealand Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, via the Royal Society of New Zealand, provided a major conference grant, and the University of Auckland via its International Strategic Opportunities Fund and the Faculty of Arts, provided funds to a similar amount. The Greek Embassy in Wellington funded a visit to New Zealand by Prof. Kostas Buraselis. His Excellency the Ambassador of the Hellenic Republic spoke at the opening of proceedings, and later entertained participants to dinner at a fine restaurant. I wish to thank these patrons of learning most heartily; *ars mercede viget*.

During the Auckland Ptolemy Philadelphus conference (13–16 July 2005) Martin Bernal, Joachim Quack and Oswyn Murray were kind enough to give public lectures under the auspices of the University of Auckland Centre for Continuing Education. Nearly all conference participants travelled great distances and laboured long in the service of scholarship, but these three deserve especial recognition.

I wish to thank Dorothy Thompson and Joachim Quack for discussing with me ways in which the roster of contributions could be strengthened beyond the already fine material presented in Auckland. Stanley Burstein and Stefan Pfeiffer have written chapters for this book subsequent to the conference. Bridget Buxton's appointment at the University of Rhode Island would have left me as sole editor; but when the task was too great for me Philippe Guillaume offered to share it. "If a man is alone, an assailant may overpower him, but two can resist."[2] Douglas Sutton, Dean of Arts, gave indispensable counsel on how to shape the proposal to the Royal Society of New Zealand, and shared other special insights ("No academic understands the finances of this University, but …"). Besides Bridget Buxton, *sine qua non*, I wish also to

[2] Ecclesiastes 4.12.

thank Pat Wheatley, Graham Zanker, Jennifer Hellum, Alan Cameron, Robert Hayward, R.A. Hazzard, Malcolm Choat, Philippa Black, John Morrow, Anne Mackay, Greg Fox, Danielle King, Pauline Sheddan, Pauline Brill, Alisa Bowden and Andrew Millar for their help.

P.McK.
Macquarie University,
Sydney, Australia
October 2007

CONTRIBUTORS*

Geoff W. Adams is Associate Lecturer in the School of Classics, History and Religion, University of New England.

Martin Bernal is Professor Emeritus of Ancient Eastern Mediterranean History, Cornell University.

Kostas Buraselis is Professor of Ancient History at the University of Athens.

Stanley M. Burstein is Professor Emeritus in the Department of History, California State University, Los Angeles.

Johann Cook is Professor of Ancient Studies, University of Stellenbosch.

Philippe Guillaume is Professor of Old Testament at the Near East School of Theology, Beirut.

Amos Kloner is Professor in the Department of Land of Israel Studies, Bar-Ilan University.

William R.G. Loader is Research Professor in Theology at Murdoch University.

Paul McKechnie is Senior Lecturer in Classics and Ancient History, University of Auckland.

Céline Marquaille holds a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship in the Department of Classics, King's College, London.

* The present tense refers to appointments at the time of the Auckland conference, 13–16 July 2005.

Anatole Mori is Assistant Professor in the Department of Classical Studies, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Oswyn Murray is a Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

Daniel Ogden is Professor of Classics and Ancient History in the University of Exeter.

James L. O'Neil is Senior Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Sydney.

Stefan Pfeiffer is Projektmitarbeiter SFB in the Abteilung Alte Geschichte, Universität Trier.

Joachim Friedrich Quack is Professor in the Ägyptologisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Heidelberg.

Erja Salmenkivi is a Researcher in the Department of Classical Philology, University of Helsinki.

Dorothy J. Thompson is a Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge, where she used to direct studies in Classics.

Matthew Trundle is Senior Lecturer in Classics in the Victoria University of Wellington.

Steve Vinson is an Assistant Professor of History in the State University of New York, New Paltz.

Elaine M. Wainwright is Richard Maclaurin Goodfellow Professor in Theology in the University of Auckland.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*: *Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*: 93 volumes (Berlin, 1972–1997).
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*: first edition, 12 volumes, 1923–1939; second edition, 14 volumes, 1982–2006 (Cambridge).
Choix	Jean Pouilloux, *Choix d'inscriptions grecques*: *textes, traductions et notes* (Paris, 1960).
Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum	*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum:* 7 volumes (New Delhi, 1877–1998).
FGrHist	Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*: 15 volumes (Leiden, 1954–1999).*
IC	Federico Halbherr and Margherita Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae*: 4 volumes (Rome, 1935–1950).
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin, 1873–2003).
IMilet	*Inschriften von Milet*, in the series *Milet*: *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahr 1899* (Berlin, 1899–2006).
IStratonikeia	M. Çetin Şahin (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*: 3 volumes (Bonn, 1981–1990).
OGIS	Wilhelm Dittenberger, *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae: Supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*: 2 volumes (Leipzig, 1903–1905).
RE	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*: 83 volumes (Stuttgart, 1894–1980).
Syll.^{3}	Wilhelm Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*: third edition, 4 volumes (Leipzig, 1915–1924).
Urkunden	Kurt Sethe, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit* 3 vols (Leipzig, 1904–1916).

Papyri cited as per the *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets* (http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html).

Other abbreviations as in *American Journal of Archaeology* Instructions for Contributors (http://www.ajaonline.org/pdfs/Instructions_for_Contributors.pdf).

* References given by author number and fragment number, not volume and page.

INTRODUCTION

Paul McKechnie

An anonymous referee, having read through this book in draft, wrote that 'If [Ptolemy Philadelphus] were a Roman emperor, for sure he would have received his own monograph by now.' We may hope that heaven will permit such a work to be written,[1] but this book is not it. It is, however, perhaps a sort of *Vorarbeit*; and if so, I trust it will point in the direction of the ground-breaking monograph which could be written, now in the twenty-first century, when a previously unparalleled diversity of materials relevant to Ptolemy Philadelphus and his world has become accessible.

There are in my opinion two great (if flawed) twentieth-century books about Philadelphus—but he is the professed subject of neither. They are P.M. Fraser's *Ptolemaic Alexandria* and W.W. Tarn's *Antigonos Gonatas*. In the preface, I quoted Tarn's character-sketch of Philadelphus, barely more than an aside in *Antigonos Gonatas*; but as a biography of an important third-century ruler, that book opened a new historical agenda, above all with the chapters on 'The teachers of Antigonos' and 'Antigonos and his circle', delineating Stoic-influenced court life at Pella: the poets Aratos of Soloi, Alexander the Aetolian and Antagoras of Rhodes; the Stoic philosophers Persaios of Kition and Philonides of Thebes; the Cynic Bion the Borysthenite, the Sceptic Timon of Phlius; Hieronymus of Cardia, the greatest Greek historian of the third century.[2] Tarn conceded that the circle was 'held together by the king's own personality', and that Antigonos 'went very near to shaping a new thing for Macedonia'[3]—(that is, failed to); but he wrote of the glory of Alexandria being 'shown forth in her mathematicians and

[1] Antidotes to unwarranted optimism are not difficult to find. Daniel Ogden observes that the supposed 'vast outpouring, in many languages, of special studies and monographs concerned with this period' to which W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith referred in 1952 in the third edition of their *Hellenistic Civilization*, as having supervened since the book was first published in 1930, was 'a rhetorical decency … a commonplace … a myth' (*The Hellenistic World* [London, 2002], p. x).

[2] W.W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, (Oxford, 1913), 15–36 and 223–256.

[3] Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 225.

astronomers, her geographers and physicians, her scholars and encyclopaedists', while contending that 'the immediate future lay with the philosophers',[4] some of whom (most importantly Bion) had Antigonos for their patron. The kingdom of Ptolemy II is an inescapable presence in the background to every page of *Antigonos Gonatas*, up to the thirteenth chapter ('The reckoning with Egypt'). That reckoning ended triumphantly for Antigonos, in victory at Andros in 245 over Ptolemy III: *Après moi*, the ghost of Philadelphus might have reflected, *le déluge*.

P.M. Fraser did not confine the scope of *Ptolemaic Alexandria* to Philadelphus' reign, but there, as in *Antigonos Gonatas*, the same ghost is ubiquitous, above all in the detailed attention paid to Library and Museum and their poets and literary scholars. Giuseppe Giangrande in a review drew attention gently to how little the book contains about Alexandrian law, or the economic life of the inhabitants of the city—but spoke out forthrightly against the degree to which Fraser made Alexandria a special case on the literary plane: 'a feature which inevitably vitiates Fraser's approach,' he wrote, '… is the separation which he has made between Alexandria and the rest of the Hellenistic world.'[5] Fraser's Alexandria is the Greek Alexandria of the poets and critics—the Alexandria created above all by Philadelphus, though Soter laid foundations both literally and metaphorically—the Alexandria which succeeded to Athens' place as the beating heart of the Greek intellectual world.

Concerns which are implicit in *Antigonos Gonatas* and *Ptolemaic Alexandria* become explicit in this book—but that is not all, because here the conception of Ptolemy Philadelphus' world gains greater breadth: it is not only the intellectual circle, nor only the metropolis. The aim is to give patches of colour to that world in some of its diversity—we contributors know how much more *could* be said—by focusing on Egyptians as well as Greeks, and on the Ptolemaic realm outside Egypt as well as within, and on the Jews in the life they led in their community, not only when they interacted with their worldly governors. Nor has it escaped our attention that the Greek-Egyptian project, the Ptolemaic project, had at Philadelphus' time both an imperfectly known *Vorleben*, in Greek-Egyptian contacts extending back before the Homeric period,

[4] Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 223.

[5] Giuseppe Giangrande, review of P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (*JHS* 94 [1974], 233–235 at 234).

and a future *Nachleben* whose impact on our civilization largely remains to be expounded.

Oswyn Murray, in the first chapter, on Ptolemaic royal patronage, draws attention to a key moment at the beginning of the modern world's encounter with the age of the Ptolemies: the inaugural lecture given by Christian Gottlob Heyne in the University of Göttingen in 1763. Heyne's lecture and its context under the Georgian monarchy furnish a way into discussion of Theocritus *Idyll* 17 and its background: 'a unique and complex courtly culture and literature'.

The regions of this book are named after the five regions of Alexandria. In deference to the stature of Fraser's *Ptolemaic Alexandria* as a *monumentum aere perennius*, Murray's chapter—which ends by reflecting on how Alexandria and Alexandrianism became figuratively isolated from the world around them—stands alone in Alpha. Beta, the region where the royal palace stood, is concerned with government and war. Dorothy J. Thompson looks beyond the pain endured by the king who (in Tarn's words) 'envied the simple joys of the beggars beneath his window', and explores the development under Philadelphus of the census and the land survey, putting into broader context her and Willy Clarysse's findings in *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (2006), with a focus on the period from the mid-260s to the mid-250s: discussing the salt tax and the *apomoira*, and their place in the internal economic system of Egypt. Céline Marquaille looks beyond Egypt, commenting on how modern scholarship has been quick to categorize Ptolemaic activity outside Egypt under 'foreign policy', while being slower to think 'foreign' things which the Seleucids did outside Syria. Hers is a substantial and new analysis of Ptolemaic activity, not only in the Mediterranean and Aegean, but also in the Red Sea area.

In his re-examination of the Chremonidean war, James L. O'Neil discusses the alignment between Ptolemaic history and that absorbing third-century puzzle, the Athenian archon-list. The chapter argues for an improved narrative and chronology of the war, and places transactions between Athens, Sparta and Philadelphus in the context of third-century preoccupations with benefaction and freedom. Geoff W. Adams uses relations between Philadelphus and Pyrrhus of Epirus to explore the place of friendship (φιλία) between rulers among the factors which were operative in forming foreign policy. Matthew F. Trundle, in the last Beta chapter, approaches post-Alexander 'interactive kingship' with a comparative study focusing on conditions of service for mercenaries, and their relationships with the rulers who recruited them.

Region Gamma consists of local studies. First, Martin Bernal engages the much-debated issue of the 'past life' of the Egyptian-Greek connection, drawing his arguments from language—especially, the language of ritual and priesthood. The government of Egypt was hellenized further under Philadelphus, Bernal argues, but even deeply Hellenic features of Hellenism may have had Egyptian roots: he explores the problem of the origins of the Eleusinian mysteries, on a linguistic basis. Next, Stanley M. Burstein studies Philadelphus' policy in Nubia/Kush, where a great military campaign in the 270s was the beginning of substantial involvement lasting many decades, directed above all to catching elephants to be deployed in the Ptolemaic army of Egypt—and to creating the infrastructure needed to maintain and transport the animals once caught.

Anatole Mori in the third Gamma chapter argues for typological links between Philadelphus (and his treatment of foreigners in the real world) and Alcinous in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*; the epic offers, she argues, 'a distillation of Ptolemaic ideology'. Amos Kloner, next, offers a study of Edomite (Idumaean) Maresha in the third century: a site where over sixty-seven per cent of the Ptolemaic coins found date from the reign of Philadelphus. Kloner gives a case study of the Ptolemaic realm in action in Philadelphus' time: neither Greek nor Egyptian, the Edomites at Mareshah in the early third century buried their dead in tombs with Greek architectural elements, and Greek inscriptions. Ostraca show ongoing use of Aramaic in the Maresha community, but Greek names were common, and Greek had taken over as early as Philadelphus' time as the language used in funerary inscriptions. Lastly in the Gamma region, Erja Salmenkivi writes of Herakleopolis Magna, a nome-capital in middle Egypt under Philadelphus: a place particularly valuable because not distinguished by quick change in the Ptolemaic period (as the Fayyum was), and not an apparent centre of anti-Ptolemaic feeling or activity—in short, very much a normal Egyptian town. Papyri of Herakleopolite origin give evidence of the local importance of military settlers, and cast another light on the hunting and transporting of elephants.

Delta was the region of Alexandria with the highest number of Jewish inhabitants, so in this book Delta is the home of the chapters which concern biblical studies, and in particular the Septuagint, a unique achievement of Philadelphus' reign. The authors of these chapters have seen that achievement as integral within Philadelphus' shaping of his realm. The implication is that influence flowed in both direc-

tions. Johann Cook tackles the issue of influence by analysing LXX Proverbs in contrast with the Book of Aristeas and the work of Aristobulus, the second-century BC Alexandrian Jewish philosopher. William R.G. Loader addresses the text of LXX Genesis where it narrates the creation of the human being, examining it with a view to expounding the translators' attitudes towards sexuality, and the possible influence on them of Plato's *Timaeus*. On the long-discussed question of whether the Septuagint translation was made by the Jewish community for its own needs, or really commissioned by the Greek king, Loader tends towards the latter view.

I myself, Paul McKechnie, engage another matter arising from the Septuagint and the circumstances under which the translation was made, drawing (as Cook, Loader and Guillaume also do) on the Book of Aristeas. I propose that the giving of the Septuagint in the Book of Aristeas is patterned on the giving of the Law in Exodus—on lines paralleling how other Hellenistic Jewish narratives riff on Bible stories. In the fourth Delta chapter, Philippe Guillaume discusses the LXX Historical Books (in Hebrew, the 'Former Prophets'), examining how the 'Biblical Chronography' became scripture, and how the texts concerned were organized at Alexandria ('the Medina of biblical canons') to give the succession of eras which remains evident in the Bible today. The work of Elaine Wainwright also probes the interface between Hebrew community and Hellenistic world, examining Sirach 38.1–15, written probably in the early second century BC, and how the text reflects and does not reflect the impact the Hellenistic world has made on the Jewish community. Healing, biblically figured as coming from God, was in practice also the concern in Israel of women and men expert in folk healing, while reliance on physicians and medicines was discouraged in prophetic tradition and biblical text. The Sirach text praises physicians and explains their skills as part of God's work in the world, but the author's agenda did not extend to writing supportively of women healers, and while the medical profession is presented positively to the Jewish reader, two or three generations after the translation of the Septuagint, healing is strongly gendered male.

In the Epsilon region, Joachim Friedrich Quack gives a new survey of Ptolemy II's involvement with indigenous language and writing. The Mendes stela and the Pithom stela are expounded in detail, together with a fragmentary monument originating from Sais, and discussion proceeds to the matter of the origin of the practice of convening priestly synods from all over Egypt, regular later in the Ptolemaic period, and

the development in the dynamic of relations between king and priests beyond the *Königsnovelle* model. Kostas Buraselis presents a new solution to the long-debated question of what lay behind Ptolemy Philadelphus' decision to marry his full sister Arsinoe II, evoking a combination of personal feeling and *raison d'état*.

Steve Vinson's chapter, almost a monograph in itself, expounds the 'First Tale of Setne Khaemwas' in semiotic and narratological terms. This story dates from the Ptolemaic period and demonstrates interesting developments in Egyptian fictional narrative. Egyptians still developed their culture on their own terms in the years of Ptolemaic overlordship; and Vinson ends by discussing possible influence of Egyptian narrative on the Greek novel. Daniel Ogden, in his chapter about Bilistiche and Philadelphus' other courtesans, gives a new summary of Bilistiche's life and her importance at court, and discusses the possible relevance of Philadelphus' marriage with his sister to the number and prominence of courtesans associated with him in the literary tradition. Stefan Pfeiffer, finally, discusses Serapis-cult and ruler-cult, and their place in the developing system of Ptolemaic government under Philadelphus.

Most of the studies in this book are clearly and specifically related to the time of Philadelphus. A minority deals with texts which cannot be dated with precision, or questions whose answers (and their implications) relate to Egypt in the Hellenistic period more broadly. The decision to group these studies with the rest was taken reflectively (I have in view at this point particularly the chapters by Bernal, Wainwright and Vinson): not indeed with any intention of implicitly confining use of those chapters to people whose aim is to study Philadelphus, but because of what each of them has to offer to an interdisciplinary conception of Philadelphus' world.

This book, to sum up, is not directed merely towards making it possible to write a fairer character-sketch of Ptolemy Philadelphus than Tarn did in 1913, or one more in keeping with the spirit of our age—though to do so would be a worthy aspiration. Its ethos from beginning to end, we its authors claim, is interdisciplinary: each facet of the gem casts its own light on Philadelphus' world—a world which was Greek and Egyptian, but also Jewish, Nubian, Edomite and more; secular and religious; literate and illiterate; rich and poor; female and male. In offering *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World* to the twenty-first century world, in conclusion, we decisively reject Callimachus' prejudice about a big book being a big problem (μέγα βιβλίον, μέγα κακόν).

SECTION ALPHA

A NEW MORNING OPENED … IN THE LECTURE-ROOM

PTOLEMAIC ROYAL PATRONAGE

Oswyn Murray

Six years before Captain Cook sighted New Zealand the Ptolemaic Age was discovered. In 1763 Winckelmann's friend Christian Gottlob Heyne had just been appointed Professor of Eloquence at the University of Göttingen at the age of 34; he presented an academic *prolusio* on the twenty-sixth anniversary of the inauguration of the *Academia Georgia Augusta* by George II of England and Hanover.[1] The occasion was also a significant moment in the history of the university, for the speech celebrated its liberation from French control (1760–1762) and the victory of Frederick the Great and George III in the Seven Years War.

Heyne's theme was 'De Genio Saeculi Ptolemaeorum', on the character of the age of the Ptolemies:

> Hoc est de ingenio eius aetatis, de studiorum, quam tum potissimum viguerunt, genere et ratione, et ingeniorum natura ac peculiari charactere, caussisque quae quidem harum rerum probabiles afferri possunt.
>
> That is on the character of that age, on the type and form of the studies that flourished then, the nature and particular characters of the individual talents, and the causes which can with all probability be adduced for these things. (p. 79)

Heyne's account has been completely forgotten;[2] yet it is full and exemplary. He discusses the effects of Alexander's conquests; his general characterisation of Alexandrianism stresses its 'elegance, charm and amiable simplicity' (*elegantiam, amoenitatem et amabilem simplicitatem*), 'the

[1] Chr.G. Heyne, *Opuscula Academica Collecta* (Göttingen 1785) vol. i. 76–134; the treatise is divided into two parts, the actual speech delivered, and the fuller published account of his researches. I have used the copy in Balliol College Library, from the books of Benjamin Jowett; after the conference in Auckland, Graham Zanker and I decided that we would publish a translation of this little treatise with an introduction and commentary. On Heyne as a historian see now M. Heidenreich, *Christian Gottlob Heyne und die Alte Geschichte* (Munich-Leipzig 2006); she mentions but does not discuss the work.

[2] I have found passing references only in L. Canfora, *Ellenismo* (Rome 1987) index s.v., and G.W. Most in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism IV The Eighteenth Century* ed. H.B. Nisbet and C. Rawson (Cambridge 1997), p. 746 n. 7.

clear pure and elegant diction' (*orationem nitidam, puram et elegantem*) but warns that there is 'nothing lofty, noble-minded or sublime, no boldness in these writers' (*in iis nihil celsum, generosum et sublime, nulla audacia*); they hug the shore and beat the ground with their wings—and here he cites Longinus 33 on Apollonius and Theocritus (pp. 79–81).

Of oratory there was little: 'for no-one would naturally expect that the free speech of oratory could flourish much in a kingdom or a court' (*iam in regno et aula nemo facile expectet ut oratorum libertas multum se praebere possit*). Its poetry is described as unaffected by Egyptian culture: 'one may easily recognise in the authors whose poems survive its elegant, charming, educated nature, but there is not to be found those highest attributes of poetry, the sublime, uplifted, or lofty' (*ingenium elegans, amoenum, cultum in iis, quorum carmina habemus, facile agnoscas, sed neque inveniendo, quae poetices summa est, felix, nec sublime, celsum, elatum*—p. 92). Heyne discusses Callimachus, Nicander, Aratus, Apollonius Rhodius, Lycophron, Manetho, Eratosthenes, Euphorion, Parthenius. He singles out the tragedians and the comic poets, and in bucolic poetry Theocritus, Asclepiades, Philetas, Bion and Moschus. Writings on the theory of tragedy and comedy abounded (Duris, Didymus, Aristoxenus, Hephaestion on the tragedians, and *de re comica* Eratosthenes, Lycophron and Hephaestion—p. 101).

The most dominant feature of Alexandrian culture was its love of *polyhistoria, polymathia, philologia*:

> Nec poeta tum fuit, qui non esset grammaticus, nonullique utroque nomine clarissimi, uti Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, Aratus, Nicander, Alexander Aetolus; Eratosthenes et grammaticus et poeta et philosophus insignis habitus est.
>
> There was no poet then who was not also a grammarian, and there were many famous in both arts, like Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes, Aratus, Nicander, Alexander Aetolus; Eratosthenes was famous as a grammarian, poet and philosopher (p. 98).

There were many learned men like Apollodorus or Rhianus who was both poet, historian and *grammaticus*. In fact grammar (philology) was the foundation of all the disciplines, due to the wealth of the library and the congregation of scholars in the Museum. This school of *grammatici* continued to exist until the Christian era, with Synesius, Nonnus, Gregory of Nazianzus, Proclus, Quintus of Smyrna and Tryphiodorus. *Grammatici* like Zenodotus and Aristarchus promoted the study of Homer, the emendation of the Homeric text and the creation of Homeric commentaries (*hypomnemata*); the writing of scholia spread to

Hesiod and to the moderns. 'That very grammatical erudition brought the first seeds of corruption to literature' (*Ipsa illa grammatica eruditio prima corruptelae semina litteris attulit*—p. 104). The love of recondite knowledge (*studium illa antiqua et minus vulgo nota cognoscendi*) permeated the culture with a preference for ancient stories, myths, accounts of foreign peoples. Thus the *historici* wrote *Indica, Parthica, Scythica, Periplous* (p. 83). Alas, none of these works survives except in their use by later authors:

> Omnino mirationem facit, quod e Ptolemaeorum temporibus, tanta litterarum luce illustratis, tam pauci libri sospites ad nos pervenere, rerum quoque gestarum fere omnis memoria intercidit.
>
> In fact it is surprising that from the age of the Ptolemies, which was so resplendent in its literature, so few books survive to our days, and almost all memory of their history has disappeared. (p. 105)

The study of geography began from Alexander's conquests and the explorations of the Ptolemies, with Nearchus, Daimachus, Megasthenes and Onesicritus; again everything is lost except what is preserved in those who made use of them—Strabo, Dionysius Periegetes, Pliny and Stephanus of Byzantium (p. 105). There were flourishing genres of natural history (*historia naturae, de mirabilibus, de fluviis etc*—p. 107). In science the Alexandrians were skilled at mathematics, astronomy, medicine, music and harmony (p. 108).

Despite all the benefits from royal munificence, the rewards of letters and studies, the banquets of the Museum and the wealth of the library (*in ipsa regum munificentia, in praemiis litterarum studiis propositis, Musei convictu, bibliothecae opulentia*), philosophy did not entirely flourish: there were few Stoics and only one Epicurean (Colotes). But the philosophy of pleasure was strong at court:

> Cyrenaica disciplina, quae ad voluptatem omnia referebat, regum libidinibus palpabat, fuitque adeo grata iis et accepta; saltem tanta Theodori fuit auctoritas, ut a Sotere legatus ad Lysimachum mitteretur.
>
> The Cyrenaic discipline which derives everything from pleasure flattered the royal desires, and so was pleasing and acceptable to them; at least the authority of Theodorus was such that he was sent by Soter as an ambassador to Lysimachus. (p. 114)

Under Egyptian influence, Greek philosophy also took on a new guise: the 'ancient philosophy and theology' with its use of symbols and hieroglyphs was a fusion of Greek and Egyptian ideas which mingled with Jewish superstition and Christianity (p. 112).

For an account of the *artes liberales* Heyne refers to his friend Winckelmann: but he remarks that the Alexandrians especially possessed a love of display rather than a sense of true beauty—*ad fastum et magnificentiam potius se inclinasse, quam ad iudicii elegantiam aut verae pulchritudinis sensum* (p. 114). Having described the nature of Ptolemaic culture, Heyne turns to the causes of Alexandrianism:

> Cum saeculi Ptolemaeorum Genium aliquem, valde notabilem, satis declaratum dederim, in litterarum quidem studio, polymathiae et polyhistoriae amorem, in historiis, rerum mirabilium, novarum et insolitarum: caussas eius rei, etsi iam in ipsa narratione interpositas, nunc seorsum breviter perstringere placet.
>
> Since I have given a sufficient account of the particular and strongly marked genius of the Ptolemaic age, especially in the study of letters, the love of *polymathia* and *polyhistoria*, and in the stories of things marvellous, novel and unusual, it is appropriate now to separate out and explain briefly the causes of these features, which have already been mentioned in the foregoing account. (p. 115)

There is in human history a natural progression towards *subtilitas grammatica, historica ac philosophica* (grammatical, historical and philosophical subtlety):

> Luxuriantius ingenium a simplicitate ad cultum et ornatum, hinc ad sucum et lascivium prolabitur. Alexandriae autem maturior litterarum mutatio facta, quia incertum regum lubido, aulicorum vanitas, urbis luxuries, civium levitas, ipsae studiorum opportunitates, motui rerum iam per se inclinato momenti et impulsus haud parum addere debuere. Regum quidem munificentia et amor litterarum fuit qualem vix alia aetas vidit.
>
> As it grows more luxuriant, talent slips from simplicity to the cultivated and ornate, and thence to high flavour and exuberance. But at Alexandria a deeper change occurred in literature because the fluctuating desires of the kings, the vanities of courts, the luxury of the city, the levity of the citizens, the very opportunities for study, must have added no little movement and impulse to this natural tendency. Indeed the munificence and love of learning shown by the kings has scarcely been seen in any other age.

The kings Lagus, Philadelphus, Philopator, Euergetes and Physcon were all lovers of literature, as too was Cleopatra, the last of the Ptolemies:

> Regum itaque liberalitas multos viros doctos invitavit: quibus, cum regiis stipendiis sustentati viverent, id studii erat, ut dictis scriptisque regi et aulicis se probarent. Inde adulatoria et parasitica illa laudandi licentia in optimis horum temporum scriptoribus. Imprimis vero regum liberalitas Museo et bibliothecae condita inclaruit.

> And so the liberality of the kings attracted many learned men whose care it was, since they lived paid by royal stipends, to display themselves in their words and their writings to the king and his courtiers. So there is an adulatory and parasitic excess of praise in the best writers of this period. But above all the liberality of the kings made glorious the Museum and the library founded by them.

The Museum was organised with *syssitia* (communal banquets) under royal patronage, but it had its disadvantages:

> Vrbis frequentia, regum facilitas et comitas, studiorum facile severitatem temperare potuit. Quod tamen in rebus humanis fieri solet, cum summis bonis ut mala indivulso contubernio coniuncta sint, hoc idem in his tantis bonis evenisse videmus. Ut aulici et principes de honorum fumo, sic viri docti de opinionum umbra inter se digladiantur; invidia, odiis, inimicitiis gliscentibus optima quaeque evertuntur. Sic nulli facile doctorum virorum coetus contentionum libidine et conviciandi licentia carent. De Museo Alexandrino non mitiora accipimus. Nobile est Timonis Phliasii dicterium.
>
> The crowded city, the ease and friendliness of the kings could easily temper the rigours of study. But as often happens in human affairs, since evils are conjoined in an indissoluble table companionship with the highest goods, so we see this happening in this case. Just as courtiers and kings dispute over the fog of honours, so scholars dispute over the shadows of opinions; as envy, hatred and enmities grow all good things are subverted. So no gathering of learned men can easily be free of the passion for contentions and the licence of quarrels. We hear nothing different of the Alexandrian Museum. There is a noble saying of Timon of Phlious. (pp. 118f.)

And here he refers to the famous fragment preserved in Athenaeus 1.22d: "Many there be that feed in populous Egypt, well-stocked pedants who quarrel endlessly in the bird-cage of the Muses."

The library however was an important benefit (Heyne was of course the university librarian at Göttingen): 'despite these ills how many great benefits there were for mankind in the Museum and library of Alexandria' (*Cum his ipsis tamen malis quot et quanta beneficia Museo et Bibliothecae Alexandriae accepta refert genus humanum*). The disasters of the successive destructions of the library are recounted, together with the organisation of the Museum within the palace and of the library, part of which was in the palace, part in Serapeum. The successive librarians are listed (pp. 121–129).

For the citizens of Alexandria games and festivals were enormously important. (p. 131). The city of Alexandria itself was unique in the ancient world: 'so much that scarcely any city of our age can compare

with it, except perhaps for London' (*hactenus vix urbs aliqua nostra aetate est, quae cum ea comparari possit, nisi forte Londinium*). Writers of all periods agree that it was marked by the *elegantia* of both *potentes* and *plebs*: the Alexandrians had a passion for inventions and devices, as well as being subtle, ingenious, light-headed, fickle and easily agitated (*Alexandrinorum ingenia fuisse sollertia ad inveniendum et excogitandum, simulque vafra, callida; eadem porro levia, varia, tumultuantia*–p. 133). Ancient Egyptian superstitions were rife among them:

> Increbuit superstitio utpote in plebe inter incerta fortunae ex mercatu et navigatione iactata, advenarum ex diversis terris confluentium et promiscue habitantium coetibus admixtis imprimis Iudaeorum, a Philometoris maxime temporibus, quorum Philo non minus quam decies centena millia Alexandriae et per Aegyptum habitantium memorat.
>
> Superstition increased as is natural in a mob tossed about by the uncertainties of trade and navigation, with masses of newcomers flooding in and living among them, notably Jews, especially from the time of Philometor, whose numbers Philo records as no less than a million living in Alexandria and throughout Egypt. (p. 134)

This is a full and sensitive description of Ptolemaic culture, which in its general lines is surely the equal of if not superior to any that has been offered since. But it contains of course throughout an implicit comparison with Heyne's own day:

> Vos, autem, Cives in ea tempora servatos vos esse laetamini, in quibus Regum Ptolemaeis illis simillimorum munificentia omnium disciplinarum scholas vobis aperuit, viros, quales olim in Musei convictum illi adscrivere optavissent, omnigena doctrina insignes, in hanc Academiam congregavit, bibliothecam ornatissimam vestris usibus liberalissime comparavit, eumque Virum summum et immortalem harum rerum Curatorem esse voluit, qualem ipse ille Ptolemaeorum inauditus litterarum et artium amor, earumque ornandarum studium, frustra in humano genere sibi dari exoptavit.
>
> Rejoice, fellow citizens, that you live in those times in which the munificence of kings most like to those Ptolemies has opened for you schools of all the disciplines, and has gathered together in this University such men, famous for all forms of learning, as once they desired to inscribe in the life of the Museum, and has most liberally provided a splendid library for your use, and has desired such a man to be the supreme highest being and immortal guardian of these things as that unheard of love of Ptolemaic letters and arts, and the furthering of their study, has looked for in vain amongst the human race. (p. 84)

This Hanoverian construction rests firmly on the eighteenth century view of *historia magistra vitae*, in which the relationship between the ancient and the modern world is seen as one of model and copy, based on the unchanging character of human nature: a monarchic system will always produce the same effects in culture, and so we can read back and forth between the Ptolemaic and the Hanoverian ages.

Thus two generations before Droysen's invention of *Hellenismus*, which is conventionally taken as the invention of the Hellenistic age,[3] Heyne had seen its special characteristics, and had already posed the central question of Ptolemaic culture: what is the relationship between patronage and culture in the Ptolemaic age, and how was that culture created? Today we as heirs of a progressive social Darwinism and a sceptical post-modernism should be able to come up with a less self-centred view of the relation between wealth and culture; and yet all too often our understanding of patronage implies that it is an unchanging factor in the creation of culture, in which all monarchies and all state funding have much the same purpose and much the same effect on the artistic tradition. Modern views of patronage and generic composition indeed lay great emphasis on the importance of monarchy as a simple factor involving primarily the political manipulation of literature, without considering how monarchies differ fundamentally from each other in their attitudes and aims, and have different effects on the cultures they support.

Thus the prevalent view of the nature of Ptolemaic poetry rests on the short and influential paper by Konrat Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos*,[4] first published in 1934, but not widely known until its second publication in 1966. According to Ziegler, the whole development of

[3] 'The inventor of the Hellenistic age or world … is Johann Gustav Droysen, who in 1836 labelled or rather baptised his creation as "Hellenismus", Greekism.' Paul Cartledge in P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, E. Gruen (eds.) *Hellenistic Constructs* (Berkeley 1997) p. 2. The literature on Droysen and the concept of *Hellenismus* is large: see esp. A. Momigliano, 'Genesi storica e funzione attuale del concetto di ellenismo', (1935) *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome 1955) 165–193; 'J.G. Droysen between Greeks and Jews' (1970), *Quinto Contributo* (Rome 1975) 109–126; R. Bichler, *"Hellenismus" Geschichte und Problematik eines Epochenbegriffs* (Darmstadt 1983); Canfora o.c. (n. 2); A. Demandt, 'Hellenismus—die moderne Zeit des Altertums?' in B. Funcke (ed.), *Hellenismus* (Tübingen 1996) 17–27.

[4] K. Ziegler, *Das Hellenistische Epos: ein vergessenes Kapitel Grichischer Dichtung* (second edition, Leipzig, 1966); because Ziegler was persona non grata in Nazi Germany, the first edition was not noticed. I have not read the earlier essay of W. Kroll, 'Das historische Epos' *Sokrates* 4 (1916) 1–14; there is a useful survey by R. Haüssler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil. 1 Vom Homer zu Vergil* (Heidelberg 1976).

Roman panegyrical epic poetry rested on a lost tradition of Hellenistic royal panegyrical poetry practised at the courts of Alexandria and Pergamon: he proceeded to reconstruct this tradition on the basis of the titles of these alleged epics, and by means of reading back from Roman epic practice. This poetry consisted of long epics devoted to the exploits of the kings, written in a panegyrical vein such as is attested in Roman literature from Ennius to the poets of the later Roman empire; the characteristics of the Hellenistic and Roman epic that does in fact survive, from Apollonius to Virgil and beyond, together with the tradition of critical comment on long poems and the practice of *recusatio*, must be understood in terms of reaction to this dominant lost school of poetry. Ziegler's theory has been accepted by a whole series of modern students of Hellenistic and Roman poetry, starting from Francis Cairns, with his belief that the scheme of the *logos basilikos* propounded by Menander Rhetor, a provincial schoolmaster in the third century AD, can be detected throughout the literature of the post-classical period.[5] At its most general, Denis Feeney can even say, 'Epics treating the deeds of kings and people, contemporary, recent or remote, were composed all over the Mediterranean, and at every period, from the late fifth century BCE to the age of the Byzantine emperors' (p. 264). The theory has finally achieved canonical status in the classification used by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, in their monumental *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, according to which 'of the 39 "epic" poets they included, all but five wrote on historical events'.[6]

This entire construct is a complete fantasy, which has done untold damage to the understanding of Latin poetry of the Augustan age especially, as I have been arguing ever since 1968.[7] But it has at last been demolished by a scholar whose expertise in the literature of panegyrical poetry cannot be disputed: Alan Cameron devotes chapter X of his book *Callimachus and his Critics* to the destruction of the theory. As he says 'There is in fact no solid or explicit evidence for long historical epics at any time in the Hellenistic world' (p. 268), and again 'there is not a single indisputable example of a full-scale

[5] See esp. F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972); A. Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae* (Liverpool 1983) 86–90; Ph.R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford 1986); D.C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford 1991) 264–267.

[6] A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995) 287, citing the list of genres in *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983) XVII.

[7] In this year I began a series of lectures at Oxford on 'The public voice of Horace', which contained a full-scale attack on the views of Ziegler and Cairns.

epic poem on the deeds of a Hellenistic king' (p. 281). While we know that the exploits of Alexander the Great were celebrated by a least five poets, all of them became bywords for their badness (p. 278); and it seems that the example of Choerilus and others prevented anyone from following suit in later generations. Cameron concludes, 'There is simply no basis for the dominant assumption that the advent of the Hellenistic kings created an immediate demand for large-scale historical epics' (p. 295).

The Hellenistic poets did of course experiment with forms of praise poetry. Cameron is prepared to admit the existence of paeans probably sung at royal festivals or victory celebrations (possible examples are listed on pp. 289–295). But as he says, 'Theocritus 17 is the only complete poetic encomion to survive from the Hellenistic world' (p. 272). It is for that reason that I want briefly to consider this particular poem, because it seems to me to demonstrate most clearly the actual nature of Hellenistic praise poetry. Francis Cairns indeed devoted twenty pages to its analysis (*Generic Composition* pp. 100–120): he began from the assumption that it followed a generic pattern exemplified in Menander Rhetor's *logos basilikos*, but ended by detecting Theocritus' substantial originality in deviating from this schema; the most recent editor Richard Hunter notes that in fact the divergences and omissions from the schema are far more striking than the similarities.[8] The truth is that Theocritus was completely unaware of such a schema, since it did not yet exist; and that is why, though the topic of the praise of a ruler inevitably leads to some similarities, the structure of the poem in no way conforms to the rhetorical rules of Menander, which were designed centuries later for hack rhetoricians in the provincial towns of Asia Minor who were required to celebrate endlessly the emperor's birthday or his ceremonial progress through the provinces.

Theocritus is concerned with a different world and a different series of problems—how, within the existing conventions of Greek poetry, to create a means of praising his ruler. The Idyll is framed on the pattern of a Homeric hymn, and its echoes of themes in Callimachus' hymns show how each sought to offer a contemporary response to the demands of court poetry. The theme is that of the divinity of kings: this may be explained partly as an attempt to place king worship in an appropriate light for Greek readers, and partly as a legacy from

[8] R. Hunter, *Theocritus, Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley 2003) 21–23.

the generic background in the hymn as praise of the gods. But the tone is light and ironic; the praise of Philadelphus is subordinated to praise of his father and mother, which concentrates on their status as human beings who have achieved divinity like Herakles and have been awarded seats at the banquets on Olympus. Philadelphus' own acts of sacrifice to them of course provide the food for those banquets; so his own relation to the world of the gods is presented as that of a hero descended from the gods. This picture is combined with a traditional description of the wealth of Egypt, and the power and wealth of its ruler which enables him to reward his poets. So after Zeus 'let Ptolemy of men be named first and last and in the middle, for he is the best of men'.

In his edition of this poem Hunter says, "we do not know the circumstance of the poem's composition and original performance" (p. 46), and of course without that information it is difficult to understand its implications for the nature of Ptolemaic praise poetry. But in fact, although this does not seem to have been recognised by modern scholars, the poem advertises very clearly its purpose and place of performance. Theocritus refers to the existence of competitive performance at festivals, in his reference to the lavish prizes awarded by Ptolemy at the Alexandrian Dionysia (112–114);[9] this feature of Ptolemaic culture is clearly an adaptation of the Athenian Dionysia. But Theocritus' poem can hardly be written for a festival of Dionysus: I would suggest that the obvious occasion explains all the distinctive features of the poem. Gregor Weber says in a footnote that, 'das beherrschende Element des Enkomions die Etablierung eines Kultes für Ptolemaios I. und Berenike zu sein scheint'.[10] The poem is in fact a sensitive and skilled adaptation of the Homeric hymn in praise of a god to the theme of praising a divine dynasty and its human embodiment: the emphasis is placed on the king's parents, themselves installed on Olympus, in order to render more traditional the ambiguous human status of the reigning king. The piety of Philadelphus in establishing the worship of his parents is indeed the most prominent aspect of the poem, which therefore finds its natural place as a hymn composed for performance at the festival of the Ptolemaieia; this royal festival for the divinity of the king's parents was

[9] P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) i. 202–206.

[10] G. Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft*, Hermes Einzelschriften 62 (1993) 213 n. 2.

first held in 279/8, and thereafter at four yearly intervals.[11] The slightly coy allusion to the brother-sister marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe, which is justified by the marriage of Zeus and Hera, appears to view it as a recent event. These two contemporary references have resulted in the generally agreed dating of the poem to between 278 and 270 BC (the death of Arsinoe).[12]

I therefore see the poem as written specifically for probably the first, or at least one of the first two (or possibly three) festivals celebrating the new cult of Soter and Berenice: it is not in fact constructed in accordance with existing conventions for the praise of a ruler, but is an original hymn carefully adapting a general theme to a precise religious occasion. It belongs alongside the famous *pompe* described by Callixeinos of Rhodes and preserved in Athenaeus, which concerns a magnificent procession also likely to have been staged at an early celebration of the Ptolemaieia.[13] In the 270s the new cult of the king's parents was the main focus of royal attention, as a means of legitimising the Ptolemaic dynasty through specifically Greek religion; this royal initiative may indeed be a Greek response to the Egyptian tradition of the worship of the reigning Pharaoh, although the ritual in no way reflects this. Theocritus 17 should therefore rightly be viewed as an example of Ptolemaic 'court poetry'; for it is functionally embedded in the religious ritual of the worship of the royal house, and must be understood in terms of the hymns appropriate to such an occasion.

Similarly, as Fantuzzi and Hunter have recently demonstrated, in such hymns as those to Zeus (I) and to Delos (IV), Callimachus seeks to incorporate Philadelphus within his own mythological world; neither poet praises Philadelphus directly in panegyrical verse.[14] Formal panegyric was not in fact a part of the Ptolemaic literary or poetic scene, because it had not yet been invented. The model that poets chose to represent their relations with their patron was that of Pindar, which involved an easier and less formal relationship, in which the

---

[11] T.L. Shear, *Kallias of Sphettos* Hesp. Suppl 17 (1978) 33–36; *CAH* VII.1 (1984) 138f. (EG Turner) and 417f. (H.Heinen).

[12] A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus* (Cambridge 1950) II p. 326; Fraser o.c. II, 933f.

[13] E.E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (1983); D.J. Thompson, 'Philadelphus' Procession: Dynastic Power in a Mediterranean Context' in *Politics, Administration and Society in the Greek and Roman World* ed. L. Mooren (Studia Hellenistica 36, Leuven 2000) 365–388, esp. 381–388.

[14] M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004) ch. 8.

poet's ability to memorialise his patron in verse enhanced the status of the subject as well as preserving the independence of the art of poetry and the poet himself. This insistence on the status and dignity of the poet in relation to his patron was indeed inherited and adapted to a more vatic theme by the poets of the Augustan age. Each period in the ancient world experimented with the poetic tools inherited from the past; but not until deep in the later Roman Empire, with poets such as Claudian and his successors, did the rules of rhetoric come to play any part in the relationship between poet and patron.

> We know a little, but not nearly enough, about the workings of Ptolemaic patronage. The catchall term "patronage" can in fact easily mislead, suggesting, as it does 'a [personal] relationship … of some duration', particularly in the field of literature and the arts, where the well-documented subject of artistic patronage in the Renaissance and subsequent centuries seems to offer dangerously tempting analogies.[15]

These cautious words of Richard Hunter need to be heeded. The most important aspect of Hellenistic court poetry is those features which may loosely be described as 'sympotic'—the easy relationship between the poet and his patron, the friends and freedom of speech within a convivial context, and the apparent lack of royal protocol. All this is derived from a consciously recreated world of the *symposion* adapted for the royal palace, in which poet and patron are equal members, and indeed in which the poet is more important than his host because he provides both entertainment and the hope of eternal *kleos*. The ideal image is well expressed in Theocritus' praise of Philadelphus as a patron in *Idyll* 14:

> εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος, ἐρωτικός, εἰς ἄκρον ἁδύς,
> εἰδὼς τὸν φιλέοντα, τὸν οὐ φιλέοντ' ἔτι μᾶλλον,
> πολλοῖς πολλὰ διδούς, αἰτεύμενος οὐκ ἀνανεύων,
> οἷα χρὴ βασιλῆ'· αἰτεῖν δὲ δεῖ οὐκ ἐπὶ παντί,
> Αἰσχίνα.
>
> [Ptolemy is the best paymaster for a free man …] kindly, cultured, gallant, as pleasant as may be; recognises his friend, and those who are not his friends even better; generous to many and not one to refuse a request, as a king should be, but you mustn't always be asking, Aischinas. (Idyll 14.60–66)

[15] Hunter, *Encomium* (n. 8) 27; cf. id., *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge 1996) 77–82.

So a king should be praised as *eugnomon*, *philomousos*, *erotikos*, *eis akron hadus*, able to distinguish friends and enemies; apart from the implication that kings should be generous, these are the traditional virtues of the fellow symposiast. The same picture of independence and reciprocity, though in a more formal and distant style—poetic fame for monetary rewards—emerges from Theocritus' description of his poetic calling in Idyll 16, addressed to Hieron of Syracuse.[16] The ubiquity of this characterisation of Ptolemaic patronage is shown also in Herondas, *Mimiambus* 1, when Gyllis tries to persuade Metrike that her husband has deserted her and gone to Alexandria:

> κεῖ δ' ἐστὶν οἶκος τῆς θεοῦ· τὰ γὰρ πάντα,
> ὅσσ' ἔστι κου καὶ γίνετ', ἔστ' ἐν Αἰγύπτωι·
> πλοῦτος, παλαίστρη, δύναμι[ς], εὐδίη, δόξα,
> θέαι, φιλόσοφοι, χρυσίον, νεηνίσκοι,
> θεῶν ἀδελφῶν τέμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς χρηστός,
> Μουσῆιον, οἶνος, ἀγαθὰ πάντ' ὅσ' ἂν χρήιζηι,
> γυναῖκες, ὀ̣κ̣όσους οὐ μὰ τὴν Ἄιδεω Κούρην
> ἀ̣σ̣τ̣έ̣ρας ἐνεγκεῖν οὐραν[ὸ]ς κεκαύχηται.
>
> The home of the goddess is there. For everything that exists and is produced is in Egypt—wealth, wrestling schools, power, tranquillity, fame, spectacles, philosophers, gold, youth, the sanctuary of the sibling gods; the king is a good chap; the Museum, wine, everything he could desire, women—as many by Hades' maid as the stars that heaven boasts of bearing. (*Mim.*1.26–33)

This is the characterisation of his court that Ptolemy Philadelphus actively sought to promote, and the reason why he welcomed poets who could both enhance and celebrate his cultural aims.

As with Pindar, Bacchylides and Simonides, in Hellenistic courtly culture the *symposion* remains the main conceptual focus for expressing the relationship between poet and patron, and for the demonstration of the courtly virtues of a civilised king. That this became a permanent aspect of the Ptolemaic court culture is shown by the many anecdotes about sympotic activity in Alexandria, the existence of sympotic epigrams and above all by the *mise-en-scène* adopted by the Jewish writer Aristeas in his imaginary description of the reception of the 72 transla-

---

[16] G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* (London 1987) 191 f.: 'His failure to 'humanise' Hiero contrasts with his strategy for the Ptolemies. Perhaps this is further evidence of the uniqueness of the Egyptian monarchs' taste for the humorous realism of their court-poets.'

tors of the Septuagint by Philadelphus.[17] Even the vices of the Ptolemies are expressed in sympotic terms—as anger, arrogance, and unwillingness to accept the *parrhesia* which is an essential part of the freedom of the *symposion*.

So in Ptolemaic culture we need to see the development of forms of royal patronage as a part of a process only partially connected with the new institution of monarchy. Ever since patronage entered ancient poetry (or had it always been there from Homer on?) there was a continuing need to adapt poetic themes to forms of patronage. The aristocratic and tyrannical patrons of Pindar, the tyrannical and democratic patrons of Simonides, existed as an inheritance of themes from which the Ptolemaic poets could draw; they could also invent or adapt themes from Homer and from established genres such as hymns to the gods. The poets of Augustan Rome were still experimenting with this inherited material, and adding to it the specifically Roman tradition of military epic often in praise of particular commanders. By late antiquity it is true that the rules were well established, and there is little difference between the poems of Claudian (himself of course an Alexandrian Greek, despite writing in a formal and classical Latin) and the rhetorical productions of the Latin and Greek imperial panegyrists. But when we consider the Ptolemaic age we are in a different world.

Arnd Kerkhecker has raised the question of the extent to which the concept of *Hofliteratur* or *Hofdichtung* can help us to understand Ptolemaic court poetry.[18] He highlights two aspects of *Hofliteratur* as it appears in western literature from the Renaissance to the modern day—literature in the life of the court, and literature about the court (*de aula*). The second he dismisses on the grounds that there is no evidence in the Ptolemaic age for writers with the moralising tendencies of authors such as Castiglione, Montaigne or Gracián: he seems to forget the whole lost tradition of writings *peri basileias*, about which I have written elsewhere.[19] He considers the question of the place of literature in the life of the court under two headings, the importance of royal festivals and celebrations, and the emphasis on the description of life at

[17] cf. Cameron o.c. ch. III: 'The Symposium'; Murray, 'The Letter of Aristeas', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici* II (Pisa, 1987) 15–29.

[18] A. Kerkhecker, 'Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ—Dichter und Dichtung am Ptolemäerhof' *Antike und Abendland* 43 (1997) 124–144.

[19] 'Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World' in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* ed. T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J.K. Aitken, J. Dines (California forthcoming 2007).

court. Surprisingly he finds no evidence of either of these phenomena in Ptolemaic poetry: I hope this article has demonstrated that in fact both are present to the highest degree, even if their expression is different because the court life of the Ptolemies in no way resembled that of the hierarchical post-feudal societies of the Renaissance or German princelings, or the court etiquette investigated by Norbert Elias in his famous book *The Court Society*.[20] But Kerkhecker ends by emphasising the learned character of Ptolemaic court poetry and its dependence on an existing literary tradition (he calls it *Fussnotendichtung*—which seems intended in a non-pejorative sense); and he once again asserts the identity of poet and scholar-commentator. These are precisely the elements in Ptolemaic poetry that Heyne insisted on two hundred and fifty years ago, writing from the new Museum, the University of Göttingen, in one of the great ages of *Hofliteratur*, when he emphasised the importance of the learning of the Museum as a focus for royal patronage and for the understanding of Ptolemaic culture. There could be no better justification for my recalling the long-forgotten contribution of Christian Gottlob Heyne, and his characterisation of the chief features of Ptolemaic culture—*polyhistoria, polymathia, philologia*.

If I were to add anything to Heyne's characterisation of Alexandrianism, I would perhaps seek merely to place it in a more dynamic context. In the first generation after Alexander's conquests there had indeed been a moment of openness in Egypt, as there was throughout the early Hellenistic world; in the age of the first Ptolemy figures such as Hecataeus of Abdera and a little later Manetho struggled to understand the realities of Egyptian tradition and culture, as I argued long ago.[21] But the closure of the Greek mind came under Philadelphus, with the foundation of the Museum, and the creation of a cult of the book in the Library of Alexandria. Thereafter, I would suggest, Alexandrian Ptolemaic culture was centred on three aspects of the Ptolemaic court—the royal *symposion*, the institution of the Museum and the grand religious festival; these three aspects contributed to a unique and complex courtly culture and literature, in which patronage and praise were less often offered openly than transmuted through the literary culture of the royal library and the Museum, and in public through the rewards for victory in festivals such as the Dionysia and

[20] N. Elias, *The Court Society*, Eng. trans. (Oxford 1983; originally published Darmstadt 1969): for literature see esp. ET 105–106.

[21] 'Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture', *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1972), 200–213.

the Ptolemaieia. Poetry was not therefore a separate phenomenon, but was incorporated into the pleasures of the royal *symposion*, the activities of the library and Museum, and royal displays at religious festivals. If Ptolemaic culture had a central or defining characteristic which differentiates it from other forms of court life, Heyne is surely right: it lies in the Museum and the library. This was the first, though not perhaps the only, time in the western tradition that scholarship has been central to a political elite.[22] So Alexandria, its literary culture and its court became cut off from the hinterland of Egypt, and indeed from the practicalities of government, and created that symbolic form of Alexandrianism that we still enjoy in the work of the great modern poets and writers who have lived in, and been influenced by, the myth and the experience of Alexandria—Cavafy and Ungaretti, E.M. Forster and Lawrence Durrell.

[22] It is a rare phenomenon, unknown in the modern western world, but to be found also in the Carolingian age and the Renaissance: contrast the more continuous tradition of mandarin culture in China.

SECTION BETA

FROM ZEUS LET US BEGIN…

ECONOMIC REFORMS IN THE MID-REIGN OF PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS

Dorothy J. Thompson

Ptolemy Philadelphus is primarily known as the rich and successful patron of Alexandrian poets and scholars, a king who presided over the development—if not the foundation—of the famous Museum and Library in Alexandria. The second in the long line of Ptolemies, the later Philadelphus made his mark near the start of his reign with the deification of his father and mother and the institution of the Ptolemaieia, the celebratory four-yearly festival and festival games.[1] But Ptolemy was also king of all Egypt, a pharaoh whose land stretched some five hundred miles up the Nile, out to the western oases south from Siwa and eastwards through the desert to the Red Sea coast. It is with the king of all Egypt and his attitude to its well-being that this study is concerned.

I start with a sick king—a king in pain—as suffering from gout he sits in his palace and looks out on the simple peasants eating their plain food and enjoying themselves on the shore below. The king bewails his fate; for him, Phylarchus reports, such pleasures are out of reach.[2] We cannot know how old the king was at this time but we may assume that by now he was getting on in years, towards the end of his reign of almost forty years.[3] Besides envy of the simple pleasure of the peasants outside, what positive aspects were there to his life that the king might wish to recall? Were there achievements which he might remember with pride, as he stared out over the water? How was Egypt changed in the course of his long reign? And if the Museum with the Library and the host of scientists and scholars attracted to the vibrancy of life in Alexandria come first to mind, what about up-country Egypt, the great valley of the Nile and its delta which provided the wealth which lay at the base of this grand cultural enterprise? Did this ruler simply

[1] Kallixeinos of Rhodes in Athenaeus 5.196a–203b. For the first celebration in the winter of 279/278 BC, see Thompson 2000.

[2] Athenaeus 12.536e.

[3] 285–246 BC.

exploit and enjoy the foundations so carefully laid by his father, or do we find innovation and new beginnings in his reign? What, in the end, was achieved under this second Macedonian pharaoh?

Any attempt to assess the achievements of Ptolemy II must take account of the broader picture, of developments in the Aegean as well as the whole of Egypt, west to Cyrene and south into Nubia, eastwards into Seleucid territory and south east along the Red Sea Coast where Ptolemaic bases facilitated the import of elephants so crucial to the army. In concentrating here on some of the economic innovations of this king, we shall of necessity give a somewhat one-sided picture. Other chapters may help to fill out the broader scene.

The foreign wars of Ptolemy II cannot be divorced from developments at home. In 280/279 BC he fought with Antiochus I in the Syrian war of succession, and then (c. 275 BC) with Magas who defected in Cyrene. The first Syrian war was followed shortly by what is known as the Chremonidean war, when Ptolemaic forces fought in Attica and the Aegean (268–262 BC). Then, with only a short pause, came the second Syrian war which ended in 253 BC. It was clearly essential, in good Macedonian tradition, that Ptolemy II was a warrior king. "Ptolemy's the best paymaster for a free man" is the advice that Thyonikos gives to his love-sick colleague Aischinas in Theocritus (*Idyll* 14.59). Ptolemy's troops were important to him, as indeed they were more generally to Hellenistic kings. "Round him gather great numbers of cavalrymen and great numbers of shield-bearing infantry, burdened with glittering bronze", claims the same poet in his encomium of Ptolemy II (*Idyll* 17.93–94). Like his father before him, Ptolemy II was constantly drawn to challenge Seleucid control not just of Phoenicia and Koile Syria but the wider kingdom too of Antiochus I and then II. His Aegean empire, both the islands and the coast,[4] called for ships as well as troops for their defence, and the ongoing military demands of his external policy placed a strain on the resources of his kingdom.[5] How, the question must be asked, could Ptolemy afford these wars, since armies come at a price?

If the easy answer to this question is through the exploitation of Egypt, that as a claim needs fleshing out. The agricultural economy of Egypt and the exploitation of its natural wealth were essential to the

[4] Theoc. *Idyll* 17.86–90, 'Pamphylia, Cilicia, Lycia and Caria'.

[5] Turner 2000 stresses the centrality of the Syrian wars to Ptolemy II's internal policy.

success of any Egyptian pharaoh, and here I want to explore some of the administrative detail as, under Ptolemy II, the related institutions of census and land-survey were developed and put into use. Through looking at the twin operations of counting the people and measuring the land we may start to gain a measure of the institutional and economic developments in this reign. The application of the census in the levy of personal taxes and of the land survey in the levy of grain and other forms of natural produce resulted in the two major forms of revenue for the king. The degree to which these institutions were changed and the extent of further financial reforms of the period are the main subjects of this chapter. At the same time I want to explore the evidential base for the picture presented, to consider some of its inbuilt problems. How valid and how complete can an account be that is based on such scattered texts as we have? How best to deal with the tenor of our sources? A consideration of Ptolemy II raises a host of such problems for the historian.

The first topic to be considered, therefore, is the census and, perhaps of greater interest, the tax system for which it was used. In earlier times, Egyptian pharaohs had gathered information on their people with a view to exploiting their labour rather than for the levy of monetary taxes. Corvée labour was required from the adult population but, as far as we know, there was no personal taxation. Following Alexander's conquest of the country, Greco-Macedonian rule brought monetisation to Egypt. Through the levy of different taxes the early Ptolemies encouraged the circulation of coinage throughout the countryside, and a cash economy was added to the more traditional economy in kind.[6] Though forced labour did continue,[7] corvée was converted to cash as the main interest of the king in his people. New taxes and new ways of collecting them are central to the development.

Then there is the land survey. Like the census, the land survey was not new. It had a long past in Egypt, as far as we can tell, and the actual survey operations were little altered. Changes, however, in the pattern of landholding and in those who collected the charges raised, resulted in increased revenue for the king. It is the details, context and significance of these changes with which I am concerned.

---

[6] See von Reden 2007, 29–57; Clarysse and Thompson 2006, vol. 2, 8.

[7] *W.Chrest.* 385 = *UPZ* II 157.10–35 (242/241 BC). Papyri are quoted according to the standard *Checklist*, Oates et al. 2001, regularly updated on http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist_papyri.html.

Just as under the Ptolemies census activities served a different end—used for taxes rather than the levy of labour—so the forms through which we know them reflect this change in their use. A handful of actual census returns has survived but it is through tax registers penned on papyrus and receipts, more generally on pieces of broken pot, written in both Greek and demotic, that we can trace the application of the census. These are the texts that form the base for our recent publication, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (Clarysse and Thompson 2006). Here I aim to put the results of that study into their broader historical context.

The main period of concern is the decade from the mid-260s to the mid-250s BC. As already indicated, this was a period marked by wars. It was also, I would argue, a key decade for the development of Ptolemy II's economic policy, though the degree to which the king himself was central to the new initiatives of this decade is a question I shall come back to. The 260s and 250s were years packed with economic activity at home. The extension of cultivated land is an on-going feature of the time; the drainage and irrigation of the area known as the Marsh (*Limnê*)—now the Fayum—is likely to have started under Ptolemy I and continued under Ptolemy II.[8] In this period, reclamation was actively pursued in the area.[9] The province was divided into a series of nomarchies for purposes of reclamation and new drainage dykes were added to those already in place from earlier works.[10] It was not just in the Fayum, renamed the Arsinoite nome, that new projects were underway. We also hear of an area of responsibility of one Simaristos in the Oxyrhynchite nome;[11] though not otherwise known, this may well have been a further development zone.

There were many other changes in this period, though it is not always possible to know when these were made. For example, one interesting innovation of the reign of Ptolemy II was the introduction of a fiscal year for revenue collection that started in Mecheir—that is in March, during this reign—some seven months before the start of

[8] The changing phases of development may be traced in the village names of the different *merides*, see Clarysse 2007.

[9] As known from the archives of the irrigation engineer Kleon (among the Petrie papyri, see Thompson 1999) and those of the nomarchs Aristarchos and Diogenes (from mummy-casing from the cemetery of Ghoran, see Héral 1992).

[10] Thompson 2007, 306.

[11] *P.Rev.* 24.9.

the regular Egyptian year.[12] The fiscal year, it would seem, was based on the agricultural year starting round the time of the harvest. The date of the introduction of this new year may be uncertain but that is *not* the case with the salt-tax, which in year 22 of Ptolemy II—264/263 BC—was brought in as a personal levy charged on all adults, both men and women, with very few exceptions. The salt-tax or *halikê* was by far the most significant of all the many taxes that we know of from this reign. The earliest receipt to survive is from November 263 BC, and at the time of its introduction the annual charge was 1.5 drachmas for males and just one drachma for females.[13] The salt-tax may have come as a replacement for an earlier yoke-tax charged on males only at a somewhat higher rate. This at least is what Brian Muhs argues in his recent collection and study of demotic ostraka, which provides an important addition to what we know of taxation in this period.[14] Two features of this tax call for comment. First, it is a tax from which a growing number of groups gain exemption. One such group, certainly the group best known, is that of the teachers of letters and gymnastics (the *didaskaloi* and the *paidotribai*), of the artists of Dionysus (the actors) and of the victors in Alexandrian games, whose exemption is recorded in an order sent by Apollonios, the *dioikêtês* or chief executive, to one Zoilos, probably the *oikonomos* (a sort of area officer) of the newly-named Arsinoite nome: *apheikamen*—"we have exempted them", he writes sometime circa 257/6 BC, displaying an arrogation of royal responsibility in financial matters.[15] Secondly, the salt-tax is lowered in level on more than one occasion. Why and by how much it was lowered are interesting questions.

The salt-tax then was a new tax under Ptolemy II and its application implies an organised approach to the economic exploitation of the kingdom, in which *monetary* taxation is a new feature. The method of collection for this new tax is again an innovatory feature of the early Ptolemaic regime. We learn from the papyri that tax-collection was the responsibility of a mix of public and private officials. Royal officials were joined by private tax-farmers for the collection of this and other taxes. Collection rights were auctioned on a specified occasion

[12] B. Kramer in *CPR* XVIII pp. 86–88 argues for a variable initial date to the financial year.

[13] See Clarysse and Thompson 2006, vol. 2, 45. Table 3:1, for changing rates.

[14] Muhs 2005, 6.

[15] *P.Hal.* 1.260–265, dated by what is know of Zoilos' activity.

and the guarantees provided by the successful tax-farmers served to ensure the revenues of the crown, while the regular royal officials in post provided the lists of taxpayers and helped in recording the process. This amalgam of earlier Greek and Egyptian practices—of tax-farming together with the use of the royal administration—is somehow typical of the regime.[16] We can gain a sense of how it worked on the ground both from the registers that survive recycled in mummy-casing and from the receipts issued to the taxpayers, penned on pieces of broken pot or ostraka.

The occasion of the tax-auction and the crowds it brought in is mentioned in several texts, as in a request addressed to Zenon, earlier farm manager of the *dioikêtês* Apollonios, made in early April one year:[17] "Please send me several jars of fragrant wine", writes Demetrios. "A reasonable crowd has come to town since the sales of concessions are taking place and they are looking for fragrant wine…" These were exciting times as the different trade groups collected and the tax concessions were auctioned out and agreed.[18] By introducing a poll-tax charged on both sexes alike, Ptolemy II was surely increasing his revenue. And with the development of a new system for the collection of monetary taxes some half-way through his reign, we find innovation in revenue-raising on the part of Philadelphus or his administration.

The same year as the introduction of the salt-tax a further innovation is known from the so-called 'Revenue Laws'. The acquisition by Flinders Petrie in the winter of 1893/4 of two connected papyrus rolls was followed in 1896 by Bernard Grenfell's fine edition of these texts as the *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. In this case, a key text of the period was actually preserved as rolls of papyrus rather than reused in mummy-casing. Roll one contains a series of royal orders[19] treating the organisation of the tax levied on the produce of vineyards and orchards. This was the tax named the tax of a sixth, *hektê* in Greek.[20] Until 264/3 BC this revenue had belonged to the temples which collected it in. In that year, the same year as the introduction of the salt-tax, responsibility for the collection of the one sixth-tax was transferred from the temples to tax-farmers. That was surely a significant change.

---

[16] Clarysse and Thompson 2006, vol. 2, 60–61.

[17] *P.Zen.Pestm.* 30.10–15 (142 or 141 BC).

[18] *P.Köln* VI 260 (9 March 213 BC).

[19] *P.Rev.* 9.5, cf. 37.6, *programmata*.

[20] Koenen 1993, 66–69, and Clarysse and Vandorpe 1998 supersede all earlier studies.

The *hektê* was now to be levied in the same way as was the salt-tax—that is, through the tax-farm or auction with a mix of private and royal officials involved. And from 264/3 BC onwards, this income-stream was reassigned to finance the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus, now established as a goddess in all of the temples of the land.[21] Further modifications of how the charges were reckoned came later in the same year.[22] The crown now effectively controlled both the levy and the collection of this revenue to the detriment of the temples.

Five years on, late in 259 BC, yet a further modification was made to this same tax-levy, now termed *apomoira* in Greek, with the specification of two separate rates: the one sixth to be charged on the produce of most vineyards and orchards, but only a tenth or *dekatê* on produce from vineyards and orchards granted to soldiers settled as cleruchs or even as sons of cleruchs known as *tês epigones*,[23] on those in the Thebaid which were artificially irrigated, and those in the Oxyrhynchite area earlier administered by Simaristos.[24] The background to this further specification is unknown—one can only imagine the special-interest lobbying which led to the modified rate on the produce of vineyards for special groups—but it is clear from the text that again the office of the *dioikêtês* Apollonios was involved.[25] This was an active period for the *dioikêtês*' office, as seen too in a letter sent to Apollonios in which the king instructs him to clamp down strongly on lawyers who supported cases against the treasury.[26] Such advocates are to be fined double rates and debarred from future practice. The income of the crown was all important and, as *dioikêtês*, Apollonios can be seen to play a central role in the way that things were going. It is not, therefore, surprising that in the same year as the modification to the *apomoira*, in December 259 BC, we find him in the Fayum as the new owner of a 10,000-aroura gift-estate or *dôrea*.[27] 10,000 arouras represents some 2,750 hectares; this was a substantial gift. Whether the grant came as a reward to Apollonios

[21] *P.Rev.* 36, dated 14 June.

[22] *P.Rev.* 37.2–9, royal instruction made November–December requiring declaration of produce for the last four years.

[23] Cf. *P.Köln* VII 314 (257 BC), a *dekatê* paid to the local temple by an Achaean *tês epigonês* from his garden (*kêpos*) of sacred land; royal scribes are involved at the survey stage.

[24] *P.Rev.* 24.1–13; 38.1, correction made in the office of Apollonios, the *dioikêtês*, on 31 August 259 BC.

[25] *P.Rev.* 38.1–3.

[26] *C.Ord.Ptol.* 23, sent 6 October 259 BC.

[27] *P.Zen.Pestm.* Suppl. A.

for support (or even initiatives) over recent years or as a new model farm for agricultural experimentation is of course unknowable. Both may have been involved.

So we can see that developments in the levy of the *apomoira* fit to some degree with the picture established for the salt-tax. Starting in 264/263, the same year as the introduction of the salt-tax, the crown replaced the temples in collecting the *apomoira*. At the same time the income from this tax was reassigned to finance a royal cult, though, as Clarysse and Vandorpe point out in their study of this tax, it was not very long before the proceeds were being directed in part to other ends in what they term a double secularisation.[28] There were later modifications to the actual levy, with a lower rate brought in for certain categories in 259 BC. The *Revenue Laws* papyrus also records the levy of the tax on oil-crops and, in the second roll, other financial rulings on banks and further taxes, which probably also date from 259 BC. This year saw the start of the second Syrian war (259–253 BC) in which the success of recent financial reforms would be put to the test.

Another challenging text from the following year, from November 258, may be linked to the *apomoira*.[29] It certainly raises many questions. This is a demotic copy on a piece of broken pot from an area of priests' houses at Karnak in Upper Egypt of an order from the *dioikêtês* Phoenix[30] for a comprehensive survey of Egypt, from Elephantine to the coast, made basin by basin and plot by plot. Different categories of land are to be enumerated, as are the different types of irrigation possibilities; along with grain and fodder crops, vineyards must be listed, together with all the income due, 'the totality of the payments to the coffer of Egypt to its height and breadth, its towns and its temples', runs the text.[31] Again we note the importance of the royal revenues. But there is more. In the course of the text a correction has been made to the number of nomes in Egypt. Nomes were the districts into which Egypt was divided, and in this text their number has been changed

[28] Clarysse and Vandorpe 1998, 15–16, already implied in *P.Zen.Pestm.* 34 (date unknown), cf. 30 (241 BC).

[29] So Clarysse and Vandorpe 1998, 9–10. For the text, see *O.dem.Karnak* L.S. 462, ed. Bresciani 1978, 31–37, (1983), 15–31, translated Burstein 1985, no. 97; cf. Zauzich 1984, 193–194. The reading of the king's name has recently been challenged by Michel Chauveau (not yet published), who would read Psammetichos rather than Ptolemaios.

[30] If the reading is correct this must be a local *dioikêtês* of the Thebaid, cf. Thomas 1978, 189–190.

[31] Translation based on that of Sian Thomas from a new transcription by J.D. Ray.

from 36 to 39—an indication perhaps of more recent activity within the administrative system or the use of an updated original.

With the Karnak ostrakon, as the text has become known, we meet the role of the land survey which lay at the base of the levy of revenue in kind, the agricultural produce of the land.[32] The Nile valley is a thin stretch of rich agricultural land bounded on either side. The desert was inhospitable and wild; this was the home of bandits and nomads, of shepherds and goatherds and those who lived at the margins of society. The valley itself was very different, as a glance at a physical atlas will show. It was rich and fertile. The early Ptolemaic period is marked both by an extension of the area of land under cultivation—drainage of the Fayum, as already mentioned, and reclamation elsewhere—and an intensification of that cultivation—new crops and agricultural experimentation. By measuring the land on a regular basis, both that actually under cultivation and that potentially so, the Ptolemies could calculate and levy revenue in kind. As with the operation of the census, many details are unknown, but in contrast to the census, only royal officials are recorded as involved in this operation. The main survey work took place at village level[33] but, as with the census and its resulting tax registers, details were reported up through the administration to the nome capitals and then on to Alexandria where the central records were kept. From Alexandria, however, and from the Delta with its moister climate, the only papyri that survive are those transported elsewhere in antiquity or carbonised texts.[34] Our knowledge of the centre is thus very limited. But what *do* we know of the land survey under Ptolemy II?

From the reign of Ptolemy I very few papyri have survived. This, I suspect, is more to do with burial practices than with the level of bureaucratic development, though this may also be a relevant factor. It was only under Ptolemy II that the practice of using recycled papyri for mummy casing (known as cartonnage) was introduced, with important consequences for the historian. Separated out from the lime with which they have been mixed, most texts preserved in this way are official in nature, but in among them some private texts have also survived.

---

[32] Crawford 1971, 5–38; Verhoogt 1998, 133–146.

[33] Verhoogt 2005 publishes accounts deriving from this operation.

[34] As in the mummy cartonnage from the Herakleopolite nome in *BGU* VIII. From the Ptolemaic (in contrast to the Roman) period there are carbonised texts from Edfu but none from the Delta.

Careful consideration of where texts were originally written and where they were later filed enables us to reconstruct the waste-paper trade from scribal office to mummifiers' workshop. And in taking this journey back we can trace the workings of the royal administration and its offshoots in the villages and towns of Ptolemaic Egypt. This is precious material for the historian and, placed back in context, it often has much to tell. The find-spot of texts is simply one of the problems to take account of as we try to draw up a coherent account.[35]

The Karnak ostrakon with its order for survey—a complete survey of all Egypt—raises many questions for the historian and may be used to illustrate the problems we face in the interpretation of scattered texts. In the attempt to make sense of any particular text, various scholarly tendencies are to be recognised which on occasion can be dangerous. Historians need always to be on the watch to avoid falling into a trap. First there is a tendency (as here) to link known texts, to join up disparate pieces of the jigsaw that may once have belonged to very different parts of a picture, to make them fit more closely than they should. This, of course, is part of the regular activity of historical hypothesis, but hypothesis it needs to remain. It has, for instance, been suggested that the Karnak ostrakon may be connected with the ruling on the *apomoira* made the year before.[36] This may well be right but it should not to be taken as certain. Secondly, we have a tendency to overemphasise the significance of a particular text, especially when that text is new. So, in the past, I have probably overemphasised the importance of the Karnak ostrakon in the development of the Ptolemaic administration.[37] Indeed, if the new reading suggested by Chauveau (note 29 above) is accepted, the Karnak ostrakon becomes irrelevant to the current discussion. Finally, we tend to forget that what we have is such a small portion of what once there was and as a result we build too much up on too little. We elaborate a theme to make a

[35] So from the end of the reign of Ptolemy VIII it is striking that contemporary land surveys survive from three different nomes—from the Arsinoite nome preserved as crocodile mummy wrappings (*P.Tebt.* I and IV), from the Herakleopolite (*BGU* XIV with *C.Ptol.Sklav.* p. 977, for the date) in human mummy cartonnage and a carbonised text from the Apollonopolite (*P.Haun.inv.* 407, ed. Christensen 2002)—raising the questions of whether this is simply the result of chance or whether new survey activity is reflected in their survival.

[36] See n. 29 above.

[37] Thompson 1994, 79; Manning 1999, 4, even considers the possibility that the Edfu donation text (ed. Meeks 1972) could be part of the same operation (under Ptolemy II).

coherent picture when in practice the gaps are too great to justify our conclusions. I am well aware that in my reconstruction of Philadelphus' economic reforms this is a tendency to which I may fall victim; the reader should share this awareness.

In 254 BC there was a dramatic lowering of the rate for the salt-tax. Less than ten years following its inception, its rate was drastically cut—from 1.5 drachmas to 1 drachma for men and from 1 drachmas to half a drachma for women or from 2.5 to 1.5 drachmas for a married couple. What is to be made of this adjustment? Is it a sign of weakness or of flexibility? Were there problems in the enforcement of the levy or a particular need for royal concessions? The recent Ptolemaic defeat by Antigonus in the battle of Kos has been named in this context.[38] On the other hand, it is possible that a lowering of rates might in fact be followed by a higher success in collection without any loss to the crown. There is so much we do not know.

Two loose ends remain. I suggested earlier that it should not perhaps be the king himself who gets all the credit or blame for the changing financial policies and reforms that I have outlined. Kings rarely act alone—though they may—and it would be interesting if we could glimpse beyond the throne to identify the hand of others in the subtly changing picture of the time. Apollonios, the *dioikêtês*, might seem a prime candidate responsible for the flurry of innovation in the 260s and 250s, in the first decade of the second half of the reign of Ptolemy II. Against such a suggestion is the order from the king against those lawyers who acted against the crown in revenue matters. There Apollonios is simply the recipient of the royal order. In favour of the suggestion is the fact that the *Revenue Laws* papyrus appears to derive from Apollonios' office and, as we have already noted, the first person plural of the ruling exempting teachers and others from the salt-tax—"we have exempted" are the words of the text.

Secondly—and finally—we need to return to my initial scene. What might Ptolemy II have thought of the achievements of his reign in respect of his internal economic innovations? He fortunately could not know that after his death a further Syrian war would speedily break out, at the same time as the first internal uprising in Egypt. Nor could he know that, in the aftermath of these troubles, his son and successor Ptolemy III would cut the rate of the salt-tax still further.

[38] Clarysse and Thompson 2006 vol. 2, 87.

It was not all black, however. The introduction of Greek ways in the collection of taxes—the use of the tax-farm with its guarantees and cash required up front to guarantee the income from a tax—had on the whole been reasonably successful.[39] And Egypt now, at least in the mid-third century BC before the big copper inflation of later years, appears to have worked as a cash economy, with money used and levied throughout the land. Payments were regularly made in cash, as long that is as there was cash around,[40] and the cash income of the crown had been vastly increased with the introduction of new taxes. And grain as always went on coming in. It was only under Ptolemy III that troubles with bad Nile floods caused havoc with that supply. Overall, it would have been a mixed report the king would have to ponder. As well as some disasters, especially overseas, there had been many successes over his long reign. And whereas it is possible that the mixed system of private and state involvement in the collection of revenues that we can document in the *apomoira* and the salt-tax collection under Ptolemy II actually originated with Ptolemy I, there is, I suggest, sufficient evidence from the ten years or so from 264 BC to suggest that under Ptolemy II some interesting innovations were made in what was collected and for what purpose, and that the state gained, to the detriment in part of the temples. The fabled wealth of Ptolemy II depended as much on new monetary levies as it did on the traditional income of Egypt in grain.

[39] *P.Cairo Zen.* I 59130.15-23 (April 256 or 254 BC), is one example of problems in the salt-tax collection; Apollonios protects his farmers at Tapteia against the tax-collectors during the harvest period.

[40] For some solutions to cash shortages, see Thompson 1999, 113.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF PTOLEMY II

Céline Marquaille

Before presenting the main characteristics of Philadelphus' foreign policy I would like to contemplate one of the oddities of studying the foreign policy or 'empire' of the Ptolemies.[1] Quite differently from the empire of the Seleucids, the interests of the Ptolemies outside Egypt are often observed and analysed as separate from their activities in Egypt, even when scholars such as Tarn or Rostovtzeff have tried to explain Ptolemaic foreign policy with terms such as offensive or defensive imperialism.[2] Few works on the Ptolemaic state have included a study of its foreign possessions and dependencies and even fewer have used the evidence found outside Egypt to help build the picture of an empire that stretched far beyond the boundaries of Egypt. The administrations of Syria or Cyprus are seldom considered as part of a Ptolemaic state, and are instead often included in the study of Ptolemaic foreign policy. And yet the English editor for *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches* has chosen, rather significantly, to translate Hölbl's excellent monograph as *The History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, recalling Mahaffy's title in 1895 *The Empire of the Ptolemies*. If the narrative development of Hölbl's work does offer a comprehensive overview of Ptolemaic activities outside Egypt, in other words of their foreign policy, evidence for the royal cult in Methymna or Cyrene, or material related to the Ptolemaic court active in Cyprus, are hardly exploited in constructing what we are to understand by the Ptolemaic 'state' or 'kingdom'. There is a difficulty in finding the right terminology for defining the political and cultural extension of the Ptolemies beyond the Egyptian realm. This difficulty is very well illustrated in Polybius' famous account on the foreign policy of the first three Ptolemies. Ptolemaic foreign policy is transcribed in terms of action by verbs, and not by a noun that would identify a united area:[3]

---

[1] I would like to thank Paul McKechnie for inviting me to the conference. It was a great disappointment not to have been able to attend and I am grateful to Pat Wheatley for reading this paper in my absence, and to the participants for their comments.

[2] Tarn at Adcock 1928, 699; Rostovtzeff 1941 vol. 1, 29.

[3] Polybius 5.34.2–9; this geopolitical perspective may have led Polybius to omit Cyrenaica: Pédech 1964, 552. Compare with Strabo 17.1.5: 'the early writers gave

> […] they had been always able to menace the kings of Syria both by sea and land, by ruling over Coele-Syria and Cyprus, and their sphere of control also extended over the lesser kingdoms of Asia Minor and the islands, since they were masters over strong places and harbours all along the coast from Pamphylia to the Hellespont and the neighbourhood of Lysimachia; while by their rule over Ainos, Maroneia and other cities even more distant, they exercised a supervision over the affairs of Thrace and Macedonia.

They govern, they rule (κυριεύοντες); their influence expands as far as (παρέκειντο, which also conveys the idea of 'establishing contacts with') regions where they are the masters (δεσπόζοντες); they exercise a supervision over affairs (ἐφήδρευον… πράγμασι) thanks to their command / their rule (κυριεύοντες). Polybius clearly divides the areas of Ptolemaic influence into three groups: the possessions (Coele-Syria and Cyprus) whose aim is to threaten the Seleucid empire and secure access to Egypt both by land and by sea; the Ptolemaic thalassocracy (from Pamphylia to Hellespont; Lysimacheia and the Aegean islands) and the expansion to Thrace and Macedonia. The vocabulary used by Polybius indicates that their influence was determined by different objectives and expressed different forms of power, and that control over regions such as Asia Minor and Hellespont resulted in the implementation of relationships with local rulers. It is interesting that the word ἀρχή, which could be tolerated as a compromise between 'state' and 'exercise of power', and is in fact partly used in relation to Lesbos when designated as τῶν ὑπαρξάντων,[4] is only used by Polybius to describe Ptolemaic rule in Egypt itself.[5] F. Millar pointed out that in the case of Rome, the

---

the name Egypt to only the part of the country that was inhabited and watered by the Nile, beginning at the region of Syene and extending to the sea; but the later writers down to the present have added on the eastern side approximately all the parts between the Arabian Gulf and the Nile (the Aethiopians do not use the Red Sea at all), and on the western side the parts extending as far as the oases, and on the sea-coast the parts extending from the Canopic mouth to Catabathmus and the domain of the Cyrenaeans. For the kings after Ptolemy became so powerful that they took possession of Cyrenaea itself and even united Cyprus with Aegypt. The Romans, who succeeded the Ptolemies, separated their three dominions and have kept Aegypt within its former limits' [translation from Loeb edition].

[4] *P.Tebt.* I 8 line 7.

[5] Polybius 5.34.3 and 9. Polybius does use it when describing other empires: Πέρσαι κατά τινας καιροὺς μεγάλην ἀρχὴν κατεκτήσαντο καὶ δυναστείαν (Polybius 1.2): 'The Persians used to rule over a large empire, but each time they ventured beyond the limits of Asia, they jeopardised their domination and existence'; in contrast, Aeschylus *Persae* 700 refers to Persian power as τὰ Περσῶν πράγματα. Polybius praises Philip II's actions who, together with his friends ἐξ ἐλαχίστης μὲν βασιλείας ἐνδοξοτάτην καὶ μεγίστην τὴν

term ἀρχὴ in Polybius designated the "developing capacity to defeat some peoples or rulers and give instructions to others", rather than describing the formation of Roman provinces.[6] Polybius' conception of power explains why Philopator and his successors were not considered as respectable rulers, despite their efforts to maintain an international presence—since Polybius implies that we may talk no more of foreign policy for the successors of Ptolemy III.[7]

However, such an interpretation hardly accounts for the ubiquitous presence, and action, of the Ptolemaic sovereigns on the religious and cultural front long after a large part of their 'empire' had been lost to Antiochos III, Philip V, or Roman interference. They do not offer a representative picture of power when expressed by non-institutional or non-coercive forms of *archē*. These considerations are even more relevant in the case of Ptolemy II who inaugurated his reign and his religious policy by inviting representatives from Greek cities to attend a sumptuous display of luxury and power in his capital. Dedications in Samothrace by Arsinoe II and Ptolemy II were as fundamental to Philadelphus' royal authority and legitimacy, and the maintenance of his 'empire', as were *prostagmata* published in cities under direct control. The title of this paper should therefore not mislead us on the nature of Ptolemaic power; if the Ptolemies did treat Egypt separately from the rest of their empire, their choice of Alexandria as sole capital, in contrast with the southern position of Memphis or the multiple centres of power in the Seleucid empire, is enough to show that they did not conceive their power without the territorial and ideological periphery that encircled Alexandria from north to south and west to east. The formation of multiple peripheries around Alexandria, to which corresponded different economic, cultural or strategic interests, contributed in equal measure to the royal status of Philadelphus inside and outside Egypt.[8] We may in fact suggest that Philadelphus' idea of

---

Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴν κατεσκεύασαν (8.10.6: '[Philip and his friends] succeeded, from a small kingdom, in constituting for the Macedonians the most glorious and largest of the empires'). ἀρχὴ is also used to transcribe the Roman *imperium*: τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν δυναστείαν τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων (Polybius 21.32.2; cf. Livy 38.11.2: *imperium majestasque populi Romani*).

[6] Millar 1997, 90; Derow 1979.

[7] For a discussion of Ptolemaic 'imperialism' and its chronological 'limits': Marquaille 2001, 21–57.

[8] See also Buraselis 1993, 259 on Alexandria, as 'the ideological centre of the Ptolemaic state', and a periphery of Greece, and how 'Greece and the Ptolemies in

his ἔξω πράγματα[9] may be held as largely responsible for the confusion that we experience over a term which would homogeneously convey the nature and extent of Ptolemaic power inside and outside Egypt. The originality of Philadelphus' foreign policy lies in the deliberate fusion between his *pragmata* and his *basileia*, which made him king in Athens as well as Paphos and extended the limits of his 'empire' not where power was exercised but rather where it was exhibited and given as something to share. Scholars such as Manning have started considering Hellenistic Egypt as part of a larger Mediterranean structure,[10] and it is now necessary to think of the Ptolemaic empire as a 'Ptolemaic space' whose boundaries were geopolitical as well as ideological.[11]

Ptolemy II had inherited the difficult task of maintaining under his control the territories conquered by his father and therefore had to give them the legitimacy of *pragmata*. There are legitimate reasons for considering the ring of territories that encircled Egypt and acted as a ring of protection, as part of Ptolemaic foreign policy. The first reason is their very basic function, the security of Egypt, which proved effective since Egypt did not suffer a single attack on its territory before Antiochos IV's occupation of the Delta in 170.[12] They also served the Ptolemaic ambitions towards sea supremacy as they provided the Ptolemaic fleet with the necessary resources that were lacking in Egypt itself. The prime characteristic of Philadelphus' foreign policy is therefore the continuity of his commitment outside Egypt with that of his father. Ptolemy I had early implemented the main orientations of his foreign policy: the defence of Egypt by the conquest and direct control of a buffer-zone around Egypt, namely Cyrenaica, Syria, Phoenicia, and Cyprus, and the domination of the Aegean Sea in order to thwart Antigonid ambitions in Greece and Asia Minor, and presumably to secure the trade route from Alexandria to Greece.[13] On his accession

effect divided the roles of centre and periphery in the third and the beginning of the second century'.

[9] Polybius 5.34.4 refers to overseas officials as τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔξω πραγμάτων διατεταγμένοις.

[10] Manning 2003.

[11] Ma 1999 carefully observed this phenomenon for the Seleucid empire in the third century BC.

[12] Hölbl 2001, 145.

[13] Beloch 1903 on the foreign policy of Ptolemy I is naturally now out of date; for a general overview of Ptolemaic conquests which still remains largely accurate: Bagnall 1976, esp. 25–37 (Cyrenaica), 11–24 (Coele-Syria and Phoenicia), 38–79 (Cyprus),

to the throne at the death of Soter in 283, after two years of co-regency, Ptolemy II became heir to Demetrios' former sea power and took on the leadership of the League of the Islanders in the Cyclades.[14] As Bagnall clearly demonstrated, Cyrenaica, Syria, Phoenicia, and Cyprus formed 'the core of the empire', as they shared common patterns of administration not only between themselves but also with Egypt, including their participation in a closed monetary zone and the imposition of taxes.[15] Evidence for the reign of Philadelphus is however scarce. The province of Syria and Phoenicia is the best documented for the reign of Ptolemy II, particularly thanks to the archives of Zenon whose duties also included taking care of Apollonius' private interests in Palestine.[16] Royal authority and an administrative framework were firmly in place by the 260s, supported by garrisons and military settlers.[17] Bureaucratic control of the countryside suggests that royal administration of Coele-Syria was similar to that in place in Egypt.[18] In Cyprus the reign of Philadelphus is poorly attested but we know from Pausanias that Philadelphus, on his accession to the throne, put to death his half-brother, the son of Soter by Eurydice, who had tried to incite the Cypriots to revolt.[19] Treason and the importance of Cyprus for the integrity of Egypt were sufficient motives for such radical action. Cyprus was an important shipbuilding and naval base, and it was in the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Old Paphos that Philadelphus himself dedicated a statue of his naval architect, Pyrgoteles, while the statue of the famous

117–158 (the Aegean). Pamphylia and Lycia were also probably partly under Ptolemaic control by 295: Bagnall 1976, 110–114 (Pamphylia), 105–110 (Lycia). On Lycia, see additionally Wörrle 1977 and 1978, Hölbl 2001, 23, 31 n. 39. Seibert 1971 on Ptolemy I and Miletus. Will abundantly discussed the inconclusive evidence concerning a Ptolemaic foreign policy in the third century governed by economic imperialism: Will 1979, 168–200. It must be noted however that control over the southern Aegean, and the Ptolemies' later commitment in the northern Aegean, must have contributed to facilitate communications between those areas, Greece, and Egypt, and ultimately served Ptolemaic Egypt's commercial interests. In that respect, good relations with Delos and Rhodes must have been equally important.

[14] Merker 1970, 141–142; Bagnall 1976, 136–158; Will 1979, 96.

[15] Bagnall 1976, 240–244.

[16] Bagnall 1976, 11–24, supplemented by Grainger 1991, 40–105, remain our best accounts for this area as there has been no real attempt at providing an exhaustive study of this Ptolemaic province. On Zeno's activities in Coele-Syria: Pestman 1981, 172–173.

[17] Bagnall 1976, 16–17. Royal *prostagmata* on the taxation of livestock and the acquisition and registration of slaves: *C. Ord. Ptol.* 21–22.

[18] Rostovtzeff 1941 vol. 1, 341–346, Lenger 1959, 219, Bagnall 1976, 24.

[19] Pausanias 1.7.1.

admiral of the Ptolemaic fleet, Kallikrates of Samos, in the same sanctuary, is likely to have been another royal dedication.[20] No strategos or governor for the island is attested before the reign of Philopator,[21] a situation mirrored in Cyrenaica where the first mention of a Lybiarch dates from the year 203 in Polybius; this is corroborated by epigraphical evidence from Cyrene, which shows the first strategos appearing in the reign of Epiphanes.[22] Again, evidence for the reign of Philadelphus in Cyrenaica is scarce. This is due to the independence and aborted revolt against his half-brother of Soter's governor and stepson in Cyrenaica, Magas, and his subsequent alliance with Antiochos I, whose daughter Apame he had married; yet there is insufficient evidence for assuming a complete separation between the two kingdoms.[23] How Philadelphus integrated these regions in his reality and image of empire, and how this was perceived in Alexandria or outside Egypt, is difficult to comprehend. It is interesting to note that Theocritus in his *Encomium* did not feel the need to mention Cyprus in the list of territories subject to Philadelphus, while the decree in honour of Kallias mentions that the

---

[20] Pyrgoteles: *OGIS* 39; Nicolaou 1971, 20. Kallikrates: Mitford 'Old Paphos', 9 no. 18.

[21] Bagnall 1976, 38–49.

[22] *SEG* IX 55: the strategos Philon son of Kastor, *archisomatophylax*, had his statue dedicated to Apollo by the Cyrenaeans between 185 and 180 for his *arete* towards Ptolemy V, Cleopatra I and their children, and the city of Cyrene.

[23] Chamoux 1956, Laronde 1987, 362–369. Evidence shows that Magas had taken the title of king at some time between his appointment in 300 and his revolt c. 275 BC: a dedication found on the agora in Cyrene: *SEG* IX 112; a dedication of a statue of Victory in honour of king Magas found in Apollonia: Chamoux 1958; a treaty between Magas and the Cretan Confederation of the Oreioi: *IC* II 17.1.10. His name is also mentioned with those of other Hellenistic kings in an inscription of the Indian king Asoka: *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* I 25. Magas continued to strike coins in the effigy of Soter, although some scholars now tend to attribute the coins thought to represent Soter and Berenice I with the monogram ΜΑΓ to a later period, therefore representing instead Berenice II; on Soter/Libya types *BMC Cyrenaica* xvi; for a full discussion see Caccamo Caltabiano 1998, 101 n. 23. As rightly stressed by Will 1979, 146, Magas' dissension was less against Ptolemaic power than against Philadelphus himself, so that Ptolemaic authority in Cyrenaica was not completely overruled. There are signs that seem to indicate a reconciliation between the two rulers in the 260s. In the treaty that Magas concluded with the confederation of the Oreioi, he is mentioned as *basileus*, whereas Cyrenaica is referred to as ἐπαρχία: *IC* II 17.1.10 line 10. There is still uncertainty concerning the dating of the inscription: Van Effenterre 1948, 121–126, but a date in the context of the Chremonidean War is highly plausible. The link with Egypt, even if materially distant, is real: at the time of the treaty with the Oreioi, Cyrenaica is not anymore an independent kingdom. The treaty with the Oreioi was not only that of a king willing to protect his kingdom from piracy; it could also serve the Ptolemaic interests in Crete at the time of the Chremonidean War (see below).

Athenian in 282 had visited the king while he was staying on Cyprus.[24] The presence of Philadelphus and probably his entourage on Cyprus was almost certainly not accidental and may belong to a pattern in which the king used Cyprus as a secondary military and political base for his power. The early development of a court on Cyprus, parallel to that in Alexandria (as I will show elsewhere), may have started with such regular visits of Philadelphus and his close friends, integrating the island into a royal domain of authority on a scale similar to Egypt.[25]

Philadelphus' interests however extended far beyond the Mediterranean and the territories that came under his control during his reign range in status from direct dependencies submitted to taxes and the presence of garrisons, to allies of the Ptolemaic crown. As a Hellenistic king who built his authority on his capacity as a military leader,[26] Philadelphus, despite modern accusations of an unwarlike personality or submissiveness to his sister Arsinoe II, did spend a large part of his reign at war.[27] Ending the friendly relationships with the Seleucids,

---

[24] Theocritus *Idyll* 17.86–90; *SEG* XXIX 102 lines 42–43.

[25] The passage from Pausanias (1.7.1), in which he mentions a son of Ptolemy I by Eurydice whom Philadelphus had killed because this half-brother of Ptolemy II had been responsible for inciting the Cypriotes to revolt, is surprisingly often kept quiet. When this exactly happened is difficult to establish and there is no way of telling whether it occurred at the same time as Magas' revolt against his half-brother around 275, which immediately follows in Pausanias' account; it is generally agreed that this episode happened after the death of Arsinoe II in 270. It may, however, suggest that Philadelphus' anonymous half-brother was in Cyprus to govern the island and that supervision of Cyprus, administered until 306 by Menelaos, Ptolemy I's brother, was kept in royal hands in the early times of Ptolemaic occupation.

[26] Samuel 1989, 72–73: 'If cult and divinity were an aspect of the ideology [of kingship], so too was, on the human level, military accomplishment and adventure'; Préaux 1997, 183: "Le roi est d'abord et obligatoirement un guerrier, et un guerrier vainqueur".

[27] Samuel 1993, 183 who deplored that "Philadelphus' behaviour [was] often seen as that of an unwarlike personality who abandoned even restricted objectives when they became difficult or expensive to achieve". For example Chauveau 1992, 144 on Philadelphus' naval defeats: "il sut également compenser ces échecs sur le champ de bataille par une habileté diplomatique parfois teintée d'un certain machiavélisme", or Hauben 1989, 458 on Philadelphus' more intellectual than military personality. Longega 1968, Burstein 1982 and Hauben 1983 discussed the possible influence that Arsinoe II held over her brother. Longega (1968, 93–95) claimed that Arsinoe was "smaniosa di potenza", and that it was not possible to understand the Athenian policy of the Ptolemies and the Chremonidean War without considering the irresolute nature of Arsinoe's brother Ptolemy. Burstein 1982, 199 and 205, objected against the picture of an "ineffectual Ptolemy II dominated" by Arsinoe, while Hauben 1983, 99 and 100–101 placed the role of Arsinoe in the context of the heyday of Ptolemaic maritime power

the so-called Syrian War of Succession (280–279) brought under Ptolemaic influence almost complete dominance from the coast of Egypt and Phoenicia up to southern and western Anatolia, with the Nesiotic League acting as the last boundaries of Ptolemaic influence opposite mainland Greece.[28] An alliance with Miletus was renewed,[29] Ptolemaic troops landed on the island of Samos,[30] while further south a large part of Caria including the Carian interior came under Ptolemaic control.[31] A gift of land near Telmessos to a Ptolemy, son of Lysimachus and Arsinoe II, suggests further Ptolemaic expansion into Lycia, while a Pamphyliarch is attested in 278.[32] The presence of Ptolemaic high officials in Caria and Pamphylia certainly implies a Ptolemaic early commitment to organise the administration of these provinces. If the outcome of the so-called First Syrian War (274–271 BC) was a renewal of a status quo,[33] control over the Nesiotic League limited Antigonid ambitions in sea power and in mainland Greece; the conquest of Samos and Ionia meant control over the sea route around south-eastern Greece and to

---

and Ptolemaic Egypt's isolation on the international scene, rightly emphasising the context in which Arsinoe became the symbol and embodiment of the "épanouissement maritime de l'Egypte dans ses aspects essentiels" (125).

[28] Will 1979, 139–112; Heinen at Walbank 1984, 413–416.

[29] For 314–313 BC as the date of Soter's alliance with Miletus: Bagnall 1976, 176 n. 46 and Will 1979, 60; for 309/8: Seibert 1971, 165; for a date in the first half of the 290s: Burstein 1980, 78–79. Antiochos is last recorded as *stephanephoros* in 280/279: *I.Milet.* III 123, while *I.Milet.* III 139 (c. 262 BC) records a letter of Ptolemy and a decree of Miletus honouring the king. Ptolemy's gift of land to Miletus in 279/8 appears in *I.Milet* III 123 lines 38 ff. and 139 line 2. Its ultimate purpose was to bring the Milesians into the Ptolemaic 'alliance' against the Seleucids: Habicht 1956, 120; Burstein 1980, 78.

[30] Samos: Bagnall 1976, 82–88, Shipley 1987, 182, 209, 298–301. That the Nesiotic League gathered on Samos in 280/279 is generally accepted as proving subjection to Ptolemaic power: *Syll.*[3] I.390.

[31] Several cities are now securely attested as Ptolemaic as early as 279/8: Bagnall 1976, 80–102 and more recently Van Bremen 2003. Stratonikeia area: *I.Stratonikeia* 1002, dated by the ninth year of Ptolemy II (277/6 BC); Mylasa: Kobes 1995, 1–6; Halikarnassus: *SEG* I 363; Amyzon: Robert *Amyzon* no. 3; Myndos: *SEG* I 363. New evidence has recently supplemented the list of Carian cities known to have been under Ptolemaic control: Kildara, Eyromos, Theangela, Thodasa, Xystis in the Harpasos Valley, Ouranis near Keramos, and probably Bargylia and Panamara: Van Bremen 2003, 9–10 and n. 11. Three strategoi of Caria are attested for the reign of Philadelphus: Margos (Robert *Amyzon* no. 3), Motes (*P.Cairo Zen.* 59341) and Aristolaos (Habicht 1957, 218–223 no. 57; Pausanias 6.17.3).

[32] Lycia: Wörrle 1977 and 1978; on Ptolemy son of Lysimachus and another recent set of articles on the much discussed problem of the identity of the sons of Ptolemy: Huss 1998 and Tunny 2000. Pamphylia: Bagnall 1976, 111–113.

[33] Heinen at Walbank 1984, 416–418; Will 1979, 146–150.

the Black Sea,[34] while the Ptolemaic occupation of Caria, Lycia and Pamphylia contained the Seleucids' movements in the Mediterranean and acted as a protective shield, together with Cyprus, for the security of Egypt. The outbreak of the Chremonidean War, in 267, between an alliance led by Sparta and Athens, supported by Ptolemy II, and Antigonid forces, still further expanded the Ptolemaic space towards Greece and the Aegean.[35] Thera, Keos, Methana on the mainland, and Itanos in Crete came under Ptolemaic direct control.[36] Habicht believes that an Athenian decree honouring two Rhodian captains in connection with a king Ptolemy, probably dating from Philopator's or Epiphanes' reign, adds further evidence for the existence of a Ptolemaic naval base on the island of Hydrea, off the Argolid's southeast shore, as an additional link in the chain connecting Egypt by sea with Greece.[37] Among this network of naval bases, Methana-Arsinoe, Thera and Itanos remained in the Ptolemaic sphere of control until the end of Philometor's reign. The Ptolemaic troops did not intervene directly on the Greek mainland, and their operations seem to have been limited to the protection of the coasts of Attica and the patrolling of the Aegean Sea, a lack of commitment that some hold as responsible for Athens' ultimate capitulation.[38] Control over the southern Aegean and the transfer of the last phase of the conflict off the coast of Asia Minor, perhaps around Cos,[39] where the Ptolemies lost a naval battle, suggest

---

[34] Shipley 1987, 186.

[35] Decree in honour of Chremonides: *Syll.*[3] 434/435, Austin 1981, no. 51. Pausanias 1.1.1, 7.3; 3.6.4–6; Justin 26.2. The dates of the Chremonidean War are controversial, although its end can be securely dated to 262/1 BC in the archonship of Antipatros: Pausanias 3.6.6; Polyaenus 4.6.20; Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 1, 292. For the outbreak of the war, two possible dates have been suggested: Gabbert 1986 argued it started in 265/4, although it is more commonly accepted that the conflict broke out in 268/7: Reger 1985 [1993], 176 n. 66; Will 1979, 223–224; Heinen 1972, 102–117; Osborne 1981–1983 vol. 2, 165–166 n. 750. Ptolemaic intervention in the Chremonidean War may have been triggered by Gonatas' resumption of his ancestors' ambitions to maritime hegemony: Will 1979, 220–221; Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 1, 279. See James O'Neil's contribution in this volume.

[36] Thera: *OGIS* 44; Keos: *IG* XII.5 1061; Itanos: *IC* III.IV 2 and 3; Methana: Bagnall 1976, 135–136.

[37] *IG* II[2] 1024, Habicht 1992, 88–90.

[38] Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 1, 279–284. It has been established that the Ptolemies established fortified camps during the war at Koroni and Vouliagmeni in Attica, as well as Rhamnous and Helioupolis: McCredie 1966, 46ff., 110–114.

[39] Athenaeus 209e; Plutarch *Moralia* 545b, 183c–d. Two dates have been suggested for the battle of Cos: Reger 1985 [1993], and Walbank 1982, 218–220 argued in favour of 261 BC, therefore placing the battle at the end of the Chremonidean War,

that Patroklos was also setting up a containment zone against Antigonid interests in the area. The Kallias decree in honour of this Athenian citizen in Ptolemaic service, mentioning the sending of troops stationed on Andros to help defend the Athenian countryside against Demetrios in 287,[40] also suggests that Ptolemaic interests in the Aegean preceded the Chremonidean War and bases may have been implemented at an earlier date.[41] It is equally unlikely that Philadelphus lost interest in the Aegean after 260 and the start of the Second Syrian War (260–253),[42] since the naval defeats suffered by the Ptolemaic fleet off Ephesus in 255 and Andros, possibly in 246, show that the Ptolemaic king was still active in this area.[43] At the end of his reign Philadelphus was left with control over the nucleus of his empire, several naval bases in the Aegean and possibly in Lycia, while most of the possessions acquired in the aftermath of the Syrian War of succession went back to Antiochos II: Ionia was lost, naval bases from Pamphylia to Trachea Cilicia, as well as Samos, became Seleucid.[44] There is hardly a mention anymore of the Nesiotic League in the Cyclades, soon taken over by Rhodian influence. Ptolemy III later claimed to have inherited the

---

although Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 1, 291–292 later expressed a preference for a later date in 255, as argued in Buraselis 1982, 146–151 and Hammond 1988, 595–599. Ptolemaic officials were also present in Miletus (*I.Milet.* III 139A) in 262/1 BC.

[40] *SEG* XXIX 102 line 25; Shear 1978.

[41] Shear 1978, 18.

[42] Antiochos probably took advantage of the defection of Ptolemy the son, whom Philadelphus had established in Ionia: Will 1979, 234–235, and may have received the support of Gonatas: Hölbl 2001, 44.

[43] Ephesus: Polyaen. 5.18; Berthold 1984, 89–91. Reger 1985 [1993], 163 dates the battle of Ephesus in the context of the Second Syrian War (260–253). Andros: Hammond 1988, 587–595. Reger 1985 [1993], 164, 167–168, and 1994, 33–41 who argued that the Ptolemies lost interest in the Aegean after 261 and that the battle of Andros in 246 definitely marked their final retreat from the Aegean. Hauben 1983, 127 also believes that the battle of Cos marked the beginning of a slow decline. Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 1, 294 and Will 1979, 231–233 are more cautious on the decline of Ptolemaic power in the 250s and 240s; Will prefers the term 'repli' to a complete desertion of Ptolemaic forces in the Aegean. A reference in the *Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates* (180) mentions a naval victory of Ptolemy II over Antigonos, perhaps in 250: Pelletier 1962, 187; Buraselis 1982, 170–171; Hammond 1988, 591 n. 4. This is supported by a letter of Apollonius dating from January 250 concerning the felling of native trees for use in the dockyards, perhaps in connection with contemporary naval operations in the Aegean: Fraser and Roberts 1949. Ptolemy II founded another festival on Delos in 249–248 BC (the first Delian Ptolemaia dated from 279): Bruneau 1970, 520, 523–524, while *I.Delos* 290 lines 129–131 mentions the subscription of a loan by the Delians for the erection of a statue of Ptolemy II (perhaps *IG* XI.4 1073).

[44] Will 1979, 239–246; Heinen at Walbank 1984, 418–419.

Cyclades from his father; the Third Syrian War and Euergetes' expansion in the North Aegean, Thrace and the Hellespont meant that the son of Philadelphus was determined to continue his father's policy in the Aegean, and the spectacular Ptolemaic dedications on Samothrace suggest that the episode of the Chremonidean War had interrupted a progressive shift in Ptolemaic interests.[45]

The arrival of Arsinoe in Egypt in 279 therefore happened when Ptolemy was at the height of his power, reaching a climax between the end of the 270s and 260 BC. We need to picture Philadelphus' supremacy at sea, with the Ptolemaic fleet free to circulate in both the Mediterranean and the Aegean, supported by a whole ring of harbours for the Ptolemaic fleet to drop anchor. It is most probably during this period, either in 279 or in 275/4, that the Ptolemaia, to which I will later come back, took place in Alexandria, attracting representatives from cities from all over the Greek world, who had made the trip to Alexandria to acknowledge the power of a mighty and lavish monarchy, a monarchy that nevertheless gave these cities pride of place in a grandiose procession. As Theocritus reminds us in his *Idyll* 14, it became well-known that for those who wished to lend their services to a king and enter his army, 'Ptolemy [was] the best employer for a free man'.[46] What really distinguishes Philadelphus from his father and his successors, is this very notion that Ptolemy II bound his power to the representation and extent of his realm of authority, in other words to the formation and advertising of a Ptolemaic space that went

[45] Euergetes' claim to have inherited the Cyclades comes from the Adulis inscription: *OGIS* 54 line 15; whether this is true or not cannot be established but it nevertheless indicates that in Ptolemaic propaganda, control over the Cyclades had to be publicly advertised. A third series of Ptolemaia was founded on Delos in 245 BC: Bruneau 1970, 520, 523–524; Reger 1994, 45. On the island of Astypalaia, a former member of the Nesiotic League, a statue of Ptolemy Euergetes 'son of king Ptolemy', probably dating from the reign of Philopator, was found, showing that contacts with Ptolemaic power did not come to an end in the reign of Ptolemy III: *IG* XII.3 204; Bagnall 1976, 149. For the battle of Andros in 246: Reger 1994, 46–47, who argues that the Cyclades were 'independent' between 246 and 200. Philadelphus' interests in the Aegean are well attested in Samos: Shipley 1987, 182; Samothrace, where Arsinoe dedicated a rotunda in the sanctuary of the Great Gods: *IG* XII.8 150, Roux 1992, 231 [contra Ameling et al. 1995, 265 no. 236 who dates the dedication when Arsinoe was the wife of Lysimachus], Seiler 1986, 107–115. Ptolemy Philadelphus also dedicated a propylon on Samothrace: Frazer 1990. In Methymna, on Lesbos, a plaque from the 260s bearing the name of Arsinoe Philadelphus was found: *IG* XII.2 513, Brun 1991, 101–102 no. 2; although it does not necessarily imply that the island was under Ptolemaic control, it certainly attests some kind of relation with Egypt.

[46] Theocritus *Idyll* 14.59.

beyond notions of control and administration through the creation of new means to link individuals from both inside and outside Egypt to his person and his family. Philadelphus' foreign policy may be granted undeniable succes in two realms: he gave a dynastic dimension to his power; and he founded the boundaries of his *basileia* on a carefully designed image of power that relied on concepts attached to the fundamental notion of Hellenism, using channels of communication such as art and religion that transcended his image of conqueror.

The boundaries of this space are probably more extensive than is commonly acknowledged. The emergence of Alexandria as a cultural centre in the reign of Philadelphus makes further sense if we acknowledge Philadelphus' determination to position Alexandria as literally, or physically, the centre of an empire, constituting the link between the routes opened by the numerous royal expeditions to the south and Arabia on the one hand, and the Mediterranean and Aegean worlds on the other. As Theocritus writes, Philadelphus "cut off for himself part of Black Aethiopia" when he launched military campaigns in Nubia led by men such as Philon or Dailon.[47] Philadelphus' domination of the south is conspicuously advertised in Athenaeus' description of the Great Procession with a grand display of ebony, exotic animals, frankincense and elephant tusks constituting the Aethiopian tribute.[48] He also established direct channels of communication between Alexandria and the Red Sea by founding the city of Arsinoe by the Gulf of Suez and restoring a canal that linked Alexandria to the Red Sea and the Arabian Gulf.[49] Cities were founded further south down to the Ban el Mandeb Strait, expeditions were sent to measure distances, record natural resources, especially precious goods, while foundations such as Ptolemais Epitheras facilitated the capture of elephants.[50] With Philadelphus' expeditions to the south, stretching the limits of Ptolemaic diplomacy and trade to Arabia and India,[51] but also to the north, up to

[47] Theocritus *Idyll* 17.87; Burstein 1993, 42; importance of the South for gold and war elephants: Fraser 1972, vol. 1, 175.

[48] Athenaeus 5.201a.

[49] Herodotus 2.158, Diodorus Siculus 1.33.11–12, Strabo 17.1.25; mentioned on the Pithom Stele: Cairo CG 22183 lines 22–25; Bouché-Leclercq 1903, 242–243; Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 177 and vol. 2, 298–299 n. 346 and 348; Pédech 1976, 84.

[50] Pédech 1976, 85–86; and Stanley Burstein's contribution in this volume.

[51] Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 175–178. The contacts established between the Maurya king of the Punjab, Asoka, and Philadelphus were inscribed in rock edicts: *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* I 25 (the name of Magas is also recorded) while Pliny *NH* 6.58 mentions the sending of an embassy to India.

Crimea where a drawing of an Egyptian trireme with the name of Isis, perhaps a sacred galley or a warship, was found in the shrine of Aphrodite and Apollo at Nymphaion,[52] Alexandria becomes the centre of a new world. The foreign element in Philadelphus' concept of his power and *pragmata* cannot be separated from his conception of Egypt as the nurturing land and the base of his power. I often used to think of Philadelphus' Alexandria as a city open to the world, but I now tend to contemplate it as a place designed as a centripetal force towards which everything converges, from transport networks to festival attendants, artists, soldiers and worshippers. Members of the Mouseion and the Library in Alexandria were encouraged to advertise the magnitude of Ptolemaic power by the production of expedition reports and treaties which, if they did nothing to contribute to geography, mapped the extent of Philadelphus' determination to embrace the known world through war or diplomacy.[53] A Rhodian commander in the Ptolemaic navy, Timosthenes, returned with detailed accounts, including one entitled *On Harbours*, from journeys to Central Africa and the Mediterranean, both probably ordered by Philadelphus.[54] Diodorus may have used reports such as those brought back by Timosthenes or Philon when he recorded Philadelphus' campaigns to Aethiopia.[55] The Callimachus entry in the Suda records works such as *The Foundation of Argos, Foundations of Islands and Cities and their Changes of Names, On the Rivers in Europe, On Astonishing and Paradoxical Things in the Peloponnese and Italy, On Winds*, and finally, *On Rivers in the Inhabited World*.[56] Callimachus' narrative on *metonomasiai* probably found its inspiration in Philadelphus' numerous foundations, especially those in honour of his sister-wife, Arsinoe II, whose apotheosis Callimachus celebrated in a famous poem.[57] Philadelphus' overseas contacts were wellknown to the Alexan-

[52] Dated 275–250 BC: *SEG* XXXIV 756 and XLV 997; Grač 1984, 81–88; Heinen 1989, 113–114 n. 16; Vinogradov 1999; more recently Murray 2002 has usefully revisited the graffito and suggested that the ship may have been conveying sacred delegations sent by Ptolemy II in the 250s to introduce the cult of Isis and other Egyptian deities to the Black Sea. We should however be cautious with the latter suggestion as it presupposes Ptolemaic religious propaganda of the cult of Isis.

[53] Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 525: until Eratosthenes, expedition reports and other geographical writings in Alexandria 'contributed little or nothing to the further understanding of the inhabited world'.

[54] Strabo 9.3.10. See Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 522; vol. 2, 751 n. 13.

[55] Diodorus Siculus 1.37.5.

[56] Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 522–523.

[57] Pfeiffer 1949, 218–222 (Fr. 228).

drians, and became a source of inspiration for the poets of the court. Theocritus mentions the wool of Miletus and Samos in the singer's hymn of his *Idyll* 15. He lists the peoples subject to Ptolemaic power in his *Encomium*: Phoenicia, Arabia, Syria, Libya, Aethiopia, Pamphylia, Cilicia, Caria and the Cyclades.[58] The poet's list is not entirely realistic or accurate: Theocritus omits to include Cyprus, while Arabia and Aethiopia were never directly governed by the Ptolemies.[59] This is rather the picture of an 'imagined empire', an expression already used by Ma,[60] to which corresponds the limitlessness of Ptolemy's power, the heir of Alexander as the conqueror who defeated the barbarian empire of the Persians. The wealth and abundance of Philadelphus was echoed in the luxury imports from such regions as Arabia. Theocritus' list also reflects the perception of Philadelphus' empire in Alexandria, and when the poet mentions the 'spearmen of Cilicia', or the 'bellicose Carians', it most certainly refers to the Alexandrian daily experience of living in a military state, extravagantly emphasised in the Great Procession where 57,600 infantry and 23,200 cavalry paraded in the streets of Alexandria.[61]

But such projection was not restricted to the Hellenised population of Alexandria; we tend to overlook the responsibility of the first Ptolemies to act as pharaohs and their duty to protect the Egyptian soil. The role of the pharaoh was not only to protect Egypt from its attackers: he had to adopt a resolutely defensive attitude towards his

---

[58] Theocritus *Idyll* 15.126–128; 17.86–90.

[59] Burstein 1993.

[60] Ma 2003, 185: 'The effect of language and of concrete processes of administration was to create "imagined empire", a space of unity and efficacy filled with the royal presence'.

[61] Athenaeus 203a. Buraselis 1993, 258–259 and 269 nn. 58–59. For the Ptolemaic army: Launey 1949–1950 vols. 1 and 2 *passim*, Sekunda 1995 and Marrinan 1998. See Appian *Praef.* 10: 'The kings of my own country [Egypt] alone had an army consisting of 200,000 foot, 40,000 horse, 300 war elephants, and 2,000 armed chariots, and arms in reserve for 300,000 soldiers more. This was their force for land service. For naval service they had 2,000 barges propelled by poles, and other smaller craft, 1,500 galleys with from one and a half to five benches of oars each, and galley furniture for twice as many ships, 800 vessels provided with cabins, gilded on stem and stern for the pomp of war, with which the kings themselves were wont to go to naval combats; and money in their treasuries to the amount of 740,000 Egyptian talents. Such was the state of preparedness for war shown by the royal accounts as recorded and left by the king of Egypt second in succession after Alexander, who was the most formidable of these rulers in his preparations, the most lavish in expenditure, and the most magnificent in projects.'

potential enemies.[62] The limits of the king's power coincided with the boundaries of the universe, in consequence of which the Egyptian borders knew no limits.[63] The first two Ptolemies immediately grasped the benefits they could draw from Egypt's position, but also the political and ideological 'demands' that the preservation of such an entity had imposed since very ancient times, explaining why the return of Egyptian sacred statues to Egypt by the Ptolemies was repeatedly emphasised, especially in the context of the struggle against the Seleucids.[64] In a hieroglyphic stele put up by Egyptian priests at Sais, possibly in the course of the First or Second Syrian War, Ptolemy II is said to have "received the tribute of the cities of Asia" and cut off the heads of his enemies who had attacked him in more ships and chariots "than those possessed by the princes of Arabia and Phoenicia".[65] Mention of 'Asia' echoes a traditional Egyptian *topos* used to describe in Egyptian texts foreign enemies in general,[66] while 'Arabia and Phoenicia' recall the list of territories subject to Ptolemaic authority in Theocritus' *Encomium*. In Apollonius' *Argonautica*, whose narrative covers Greek and Barbarian areas from Greece to Africa, as pointed out by Stephens, Egypt is not anymore the 'other' but becomes assimilated to the Greek world.[67] Again, the foreign policy of Philadelphus cannot simply be separated from the way the Ptolemaic ruler conceived his *archè*, that is both his power and empire, and how this affected his legitimacy as king. Philadelphus did more than expand the core of his power to a periphery of territories; his acts of donations or piety and his constant visibility in areas that were not under Ptolemaic control suggest that his

[62] Grimal 1986, 652–682.

[63] Grimal 1986, 685.

[64] This 'cliché' of Ptolemaic propaganda appears in the Satrap Stele: Cairo CG 22181, translation in Bevan 1927, 28–32 (Ptolemy I); the Adulis inscription: *OGIS* 54 lines 20–24 and the Canopus decree: *OGIS* 56 lines 10–11 (Ptolemy III). Heinen at Walbank 1984, 417: 'From the point of view of native Egyptians Ptolemaic foreign policy could be perceived as the continuation of their age-old traditions in the struggle against "the foreign lands", against the enemies of Egypt and its gods'. In the trilingual Raphia Decree published after the battle of Raphia in 217, Philopator is praised for having brought back objects stolen by Antiochus: full bibliography in Hölbl 2001, 174 nn. 23–24.

[65] Bevan 1927, 61–62, Thiers 1999.

[66] Grimal 1988, 245–246.

[67] Stephens 2003, 183. Green 1997, 61–62 on Apollonius' efforts at composing a model of Hellenic self-definition with the figure of Herakles as Hellene *par excellence*, and the idea of 'a Hellenic venture to the world's ends'.

power rested on a certain sense of ubiquity and the projection of an identity to which individuals, specifically Greeks, could relate.

Philadelphus was remembered by Appian as "the most formidable of [the Hellenistic kings] in his preparations, the most lavish in expenditure, and the most magnificent in projects".[68] The distinctive status of Philadelphus among Greeks in comparison to other members of his family is certainly no coincidence: this is how Philadelphus wanted to be publicised, and he made sure to keep records of his acts of generosity and *philanthropia*. The Ptolemaic king ensured that precisely his name and that of his family would be remembered, and his dynastic policy when directed outside Egypt was a policy of names. The first name to receive public exposure was that of his father as Soter, the Saviour, and subsequently of his parents as Theoi Soteres.[69] The establishment of a cult of Soter must have happened early in the reign of Philadelphus and was most probably made official on the occasion of the Ptolemaia, that is, in a festival directed towards the whole Greek world.[70] That Philadelphus chose to launch the official celebration of this new dynastic cult in front of an international audience tells a lot about his own conception of kingship. Hazzard has tried to relate the date of the festival to the introduction of a Soter era in 262, and to the political gain that could be drawn at times when Philadelphus was supposedly on the decline.[71] But the festival of the Ptolemaia is not that of a king whose popularity is waning because of an incestuous marriage and heavy taxation. It is the celebration of a king at the top of his power who is creating a kind of dynastic mythology of the Ptolemaic family and consequently wants to assert the continuity of his rule with that of his father. An earlier context in 279/8 seems therefore more appropriate. More than Alexander

[68] Appian *Praef.* 10.

[69] Theoi Soteres: Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 218–219, 228, 271. Mentioned in inscriptions from Chytroi (Cyprus): Mitford, 'Further Contributions', 127–128 no. 27; Ptolemais (Cyrenaica): *OGIS* 33; Cyrene (uncertain date): *OGIS* 22; Samothrace: *OGIS* 23; Samos: *OGIS* 29 and 724, Thera: *IG* XII.3 331, 1387, 1388 (the context of this dedication to Ptolemy [III], the Saviour Gods and the Philadephoi Gods seems to imply that it does not refer to the Dioscouroi); Xanthos: *SEG* XXXVI 1220; Ephesus: *SEG* XXXIX 1234 (uncertain whether this dedication to Ptolemy, Arsinoe and the Saviour Gods specifically refers to Ptolemy I and Berenice).

[70] Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 228.

[71] 'Soter era': Hazzard 2000, 25–46. On dating the Grand Procession to the year 262 BC based on astronomical grounds: Hazzard and Fitzgerald 1991. See Thompson 2000, 381–388 who convincingly argued in favour of a date in 279/8 BC; 383–385 for a summary of the main objections against Hazzard's dating.

and besides Dionysos, it is Soter who is the true hero of the magnificent *pompè* in Alexandria. That Soter received his name from Philadelphus rather than from the Rhodians is a strong possibility, originating in a context of legitimacy and continuity.[72] Ptolemy I was the king who had saved the freedom of Greek cities on several occasions, as this is made clear in the decree in honour of Kallias, the Nikouria decree, or Philadelphus' letter to Miletus in 262.[73] In the latter document, Ptolemy II recalls the σπουδή that himself, by a gift of land (lines 2–3), and his father, by relieving the city from taxes and tolls (lines 5–6), showed towards the city. He urges Miletus to maintain the same *hairesis* towards him, in exchange for which he will continue to show good treatment towards the city (lines 12–14). In the decree that follows, the relationship between Miletus and Ptolemy II is mentioned as a renewal of the *philia* and *symmachia* with Ptolemy I (lines 28–29). Honours were paid to Ptolemy I, since the Milesian decree mentions the erection of a statue of 'Ptolemy god Soter' in the sanctuary of Apollo (lines 53–55); this has to be interpreted as a symbolic gesture that will bind the city to the Ptolemies. Philadelphus had strongly reminded Miletus of these bonds: the city will keep the same disposition towards the king εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον, and in consequence, that is, in royal discourse, *in return* (ἵνα καί), the king will show even greater care for the city (lines 12–14). This dynastic time turned into a leitmotiv and was again at the heart of a later letter of Euergetes to Xanthos in 242, where Ptolemy III praises the citizens for maintaining their *hairesis* towards the king and for remembering the benefactions bestowed upon the city by himself, his father and his grandfather.[74] The same discourse can be observed

[72] Diodorus Siculus 20.100.3–4; Pausanias 1.8.6 claimed more specifically that its was the Rhodians who gave the cult title Soter to Ptolemy I after he helped them against Demetrios Poliorcetes in 304 but there is no evidence that Soter was used during his lifetime. Hazzard (1992) dates it from 263/2 BC, ie. about the same year as the Nikouria decree, where divine honours are mentioned: see infra for doubts against the validity of such a late date.

[73] *SEG* XXVIII 60.25–36; *Syll.*[3] 390 11–15; *I.Milet.* III. 139. Diodorus Siculus 20.37.1–2 (308 BC): 'moving on to the Isthmus, he took Sikyon and Corinth from Cratesipolis […]. Now Ptolemy planned to free the other Greek cities also, thinking that the goodwill of the Greeks would be a great gain for him in his own undertaking.' See Seibert 1971 on Soter's alliance with Miletus, and Burstein 1980, 78; discussion on the date of the document in Welles 1934 no. 14, bibliography in Ameling et al. 1995, 326–329 no. 275.

[74] *SEG* XXXVI 1218 ll. 21–24, Bousquet 1986. The letter informs us that Xanthian *theoroi* were sent to Alexandria on the occasion of the Ptolemaia and the Theadelphia. Xanthos was under Ptolemaic direct control from the reign of Philadelphus down to

in the decree of acceptance of the first Ptolemaia by the League of the Islanders in 279/8.[75] The first part of the decree until line 38 probably repeated parts of the king's letter, in which Ptolemy II asked the cities invited to the Ptolemaia to remember how his father 'liberated the cities, restored their laws, re-established their ancestral constitution and relieved them from taxation' (lines 14–16), and he must have recalled how, "having inherited the kingship" (lines 17–18),[76] he continued "to show the same *eunoia* and *epimeleia* to the Nesiotes and the other Hellenes" (lines 18–20). The legitimacy of Philadelphus' power in Miletus, that is in an allied city, or with the League of the Islanders, was defined according to his inheritance of kingship (lines 27–28: διαδεξάμενος τε τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος καὶ ἀνανεωσάμενος τήν τε φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν), a kingship which became inseparable from the concept of freedom. Mention of the name of Soter and his divinisation therefore served to make the time of subjection potentially infinite. The central theme of Philadelphus' letters, and part of the motivation behind the honours bestowed on Soter, hence found echo in the Greek definition of freedom, by which the Greeks should be in essence *eleutheroi*, *autonomoi*, *aphrouretoi*, and *aphorologetoi*.[77] This paternal inheritance is also present in Theocritus' eulogy of Ptolemy II, praising his filial piety, by which he consecrated temples devoted to his parents, his integrity towards the safety of his inheritance, and the memory of his Atreid ancestors.[78] I would like to venture a suggestion on the staging of the Great Procession. Again, several topoi are repeatedly exhibited, such as the links with Dionysios as conqueror or patron of the arts,[79] and Ptolemy II as the master of Greek and barbarian cities.[80] The cart carrying statues of Ptolemy I and Alexander is particularly interesting

197: Bagnall 1976, 108, Hieronymus *FGrHist* 260 F 46 (Antiochos III occupies cities in Lycia).

[75] *Syll.*[3] 390; Austin 1981, 359–361 no. 218, Merker 1970, 141–160.

[76] I prefer that translation to 'kingdom' in Austin 1981, 358, since it better conveys the link between power over territories and the person of the king.

[77] Smyrna was granted freedom and exemption from tribute by Seleukos II, and the Smyrnaeans praised the king for preserving their *autonomia* and *demokratia*: *OGIS* 228 lines 6–8 and *OGIS* 229 lines 10–11.

[78] Theocritus *Idyll* 17.121–130, esp. 104 and 116–120.

[79] Rice 1983, 52–55, 82–85. The presence of Dionysos and Philadelphus' patronage of arts may have spurred the foundation of the Guild of Dionysiac artists, whose members paraded during the procession (Athenaeus 198c), thereafter tying the fate and identity of the Ptolemaic dynasty to its cultural and artistic influence.

[80] Rice 1983, 107, Thompson 2000, 375.

and has been often quoted as the illustration of Philadelphus' foreign commitment outside Egypt (Athenaeus 201d):

> … [then came] statues of Alexander and Ptolemy, wearing ivy-crowns made of gold. The statue of Arete standing next to Ptolemy had an olive-crown made of gold. Priapus stood next to them with a golden ivy-crown. The city of Corinth, standing next to Ptolemy, was crowned with a golden diadem. […] This four-wheeled carriage was followed by women wearing expensive clothes and ornaments; they were given the names of cities, some of Ionia and the rest of the Greek cities which were established in Asia and the islands and had been under Persian rule; they all wore golden crowns.

I have always wondered on the presence of Arete and Priapus among these real characters. Priapus was the god of fertility and wealth, and his presence was a strong message directed towards those who wished to benefit from Ptolemaic power. It is therefore no coincidence that the god was honoured by a retired officer on the island of Thera as the bringer of wealth.[81] He is also the son of Dionysos, again exhibiting the significance of father-and-son relationships. Arete on the other hand was worshipped in ancient Greece as the personification of virtue and valour, therefore incarnating the Greek ideal of the noble man. Arete had advised Herakles, Ptolemy's ancestor, on fighting for a life of glory and honour, but she was also the sister of Homonoia, and they were both known as the Praxidikai, the Exacters of Justice. The concept of Homonoia was highly prized by both the Greeks and Ptolemy II: the alliance sealed between the Greek cities and Ptolemy in the Chremonidean war was to preserve *homonoia* and save the cities.[82] The synedrion of the Hellenes gathered at Platea to honour the Athenian Glaukon who, while in Philadelphus' service, had greatly contributed to the cult of Zeus Eleutherios and Homonoia.[83] Arete therefore expressed

---

[81] *IG* XII.3 421.

[82] *Homonoia* was, together with *eleutheria*, one of the key concepts in the propaganda of the Chremonidean War; it appears from the Chremonidean Decree (*Syll.*[3] 434–435 lines 13–14, 31, 35–36), and the decree in honour of Glaukon at Platea (Etienne and Piérart 1975, 53 lines 17–20, 24, 29–30, 39–40). See Thiérault 1996, 101–130 on *homonoia* in the Hellenistic period.

[83] Etienne and Piérart 1975; Pouilloux 1975; Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 3, 277; Habicht 1992, 73. In *IG* XII.1 25 Glaukon is named as proxenos of Rhodes, perhaps when he was in Ptolemaic service: Etienne and Piérart 1975, 57. He was the eponymous priest of Alexander in 255–254: Clarysse and van der Veken 1983, no. 36. Criscuolo 2003, 321–322 has recently challenged the dating of the monument from Olympia generally restored as being a dedication to Glaukon by Ptolemy III and favoured instead an attribution to Ptolemy I or II.

the spirit of Philadelphus' policy outside Egypt and the procession marked the reconciliation between Arete wearing an olive wreath and Corinth bearing a diadem. Is it then such a coincidence that according to the second century Alexandrian geographer Mnaseas, as mentioned in the Suda, the father of Arete was Soter? Such affiliation seems to be restricted to Mnaseas' work, but an Alexandrian mythological interpretation could offer an explanation for the presence of Arete in the procession.[84]

Philadelphus' dynastic policy of names took another turn at the death of his sister and wife Arsinoe. There is no space fully to develop this fascinating subject. The point I would like to stress is how Philadelphus used the name of Arsinoe to give an identity, a colour, to the representation of his empire as a sea power. Ptolemy I had already distinguished himself by the quality of his fleet, and the ironic toast of Demetrios to Ptolemy the Nauarch after Soter's defeat at Salamis in 306 should not mislead us as to the extent of his sea power.[85] Ptolemy II however took a step further and linked this power to the dynasty by creating a deity, Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Kypris. Three epigrams by Posidippus record the erection of the temple by Kallikrates of Samos, the then admiral of the Ptolemaic fleet and first eponymous priest of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi in 269/8.[86] The goddess Arsinoe-Aphrodite-

---

[84] Suda s.v. Πραξιδίκη fr. 17 FHG (3.152). Mnaseas: Fraser 1972, vol. 1, 524–525, vol. 2, 755 n. 41–42, Cappelletto 2003.

[85] Plutarch *Demetrius* 25.7–8.

[86] AB 39, 116 and 119. Eponymous priesthood of Kallikrates: *P. Hibeh* II 199 line 12; Clarysse and Van der Veken 1983, no. 19; Hauben 1970, 62ff. Dedication of a bronze chariot to the gods Adelphoi: AB 74; Bing 2002/3 places it in Alexandria while Criscuolo favours a location in Delphi: Criscuolo 2003, 324 and n. 58. Two statues of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II at Olympia dedicated by Kallikrates: *OGIS* 26 and 27. Samian dedication ὑπὲρ king Ptolemy, Arsinoe Philadelphus and 'Kallikrates the nauarch': *OGIS* 29 and 724, discussion in Hauben 1970, 37–39. For a possible use of the epithet Philadelphus during Arsinoe's lifetime, see Hauben 1970, 38 n. 3. The wording of the dedication is quite puzzling since Arsinoe II is usually referred to as Philadelphus after her divinisation which occurred after her death, while ὑπὲρ-dedications usually include the living sovereigns: Hauben 1970, 38. It is also not clear why only Ptolemy is referred to (if the restoration is correct) as 'son of the (gods) Soteres', which might suggest a date after the death of Arsinoe II; for the use of 'Soteres' alone without 'theoi', see Fraser 1956, 49–55, esp. 50 no. 2. Dedication by the Samian people to the nauarch Kallikrates, probably placed in the sanctuary dedicated to the Dioscouroi, the protectors of navigation: Hauben 1970, 48–49 and Appendix 83–84. His name is mentioned in another dedication found on Samos: *SEG* I 370. Statue erected by the League of the Islanders on Delos: *IG* XI.4 1127; *Choix* 25. A statue of Kallikrates stood in the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Old Paphos on Cyprus, perhaps a royal dedication: Mitford 'Old Paphos', 9 no. 18. He was made proxenos and citizen of Olus

Kypris-Zephyritis was to be the protector of seafarers and of Greek maidens about to enter marriage. Votive plaques bearing the name of Arsinoe Philadelphus in the genitive were found in important coastal cities, in Cyprus, Lesbos, Delos, Paros, Ios, Amorgos, Samos, Thera, Miletus, and Eretria,[87] where Arsinoe must have been worshipped in private or public cults, taking elements from her cult as Aphrodite Euploia as Louis Robert famously demonstrated.[88] To these plaques must be added *oinochoai* uncovered outside Egypt and dedicated to Arsinoe Philadelphus.[89] The divine aura of this maritime divinity was supported by a ring of coastal foundations scattered around the Mediterranean and the Aegean, up to eleven foundations in total, all bearing the name of Arsinoe, therefore standing for both the queen and the goddess.[90] Most of these foundations were located in territories under Ptolemaic control but some represented enclaves of Ptolemaic authority in strategic areas such as Methana-Arsinoe or the Arsinoe foundations in Crete. From an inscription recording the settlement of a dispute between Arsinoe and Nagidos in Cilicia, we learn that the city was founded by the strategos of Cilicia under Ptolemy II, Aetos from Aspendos, that the Arsinoeans worshipped the Gods Adelphoi and had a *temenos* of Arsinoe.[91] The son and successor of Aetos, Thraseas, speaking in the first person plural, and therefore in the name of the king, explains why he came to settle the city's future. Among these reasons, βουλόμεθα τὴν πόλιν ἀξίαν τῆς ἐπωνυμίας ποιεῖν: "we want to make the city worthy of its name".[92] These Arsinoe cities epitomised the true nature of Philadelphus' power: sea domination and, through the god-

(Crete), together with Patroklos, Perigenes, and another son of Boiskos, Kallikrates' father, probably at the beginning of the Chremonidean War, during Patroklos' journey from Alexandria to Greece (Launey 1945, 35–39 and 43): *IC* I.XXII 4A lines 37–38. Kallikrates dedicated a sanctuary to Isis and Anubis, ὑπὲρ king Ptolemy and queen Arsinoe, at Canopus: Malaise 1994, 354.

[87] Cyprus: see Mitford 1939, 30–31; 1961, 7–8; 1971, 114–115; Nicolaou 1971, 21; Lesbos: *IG* XII.2 513; Brun 1991, 101–102 no. 2; Delos: *IG* XI.4 1303; Bruneau 1970, 544; Paros: *IG* XII.5 264, 265, 266; Ios: *IG* XII.5 16; Amorgos: *IG* XII.7 99 (Arkesine); *IG* XII.7 263–264 (Minoa); Samos: Robert (1938) 115 n. 2; Thera: *IG* XII.3 462; 1386; *IG* XII Suppl. 156; Miletus: *OGIS* 34; Robert 1966, 206; Eretria: *BCH* 114 (1990), 809.

[88] Robert 1966.

[89] Thompson 1973, 125–126 no. 1. Thompson argues that the *oinochoai* could have been brought back by visitors to Alexandria.

[90] For an overall survey and discussion of these foundations: Marquaille 2001, 175–193.

[91] *SEG* XXXIX 1426; Habicht and Jones 1989, 317–346, Sosin 1997.

[92] *SEG* XXXIX 1426 line 10.

dess Arsinoe-Aphrodite, security and fertility. At the heyday of Ptolemaic thalassocracy, at a time which allowed the royal couple to be formed by the untraditional union of a brother and a sister, the royal patronage of a goddess and its assimilation with Aphrodite whose birthplace in Cyprus was at the heart of the Ptolemaic empire, a goddess who could represent the very identity of Ptolemaic power abroad and give legitimacy to the royal couple and to the 'souvenir' of the great queen Arsinoe, was of course not only symbolic but terribly clever.

This policy of names, finally, would not have been possible without the formidable human network implemented by Philadelphus. We already encountered Kallikrates of Samos, whose name we found at Olympia, Miletus, Old Paphos, Olus in Crete, as well as on Delos and Samos; we also came across the Athenian Kallias, who had served both Philadelphus and Philadelphus' father. As a close member of the king's entourage, φίλος τῶν βασιλέων according to Strabo,[93] Sostratos of Cnidus, famous for the dedication that consecrated the Lighthouse on the island of Pharos, also spent a considerable amount of his time promoting his king around Greece, the Mediterraean and the Aegean.[94] From the 280s down to the end of the 270s, Sostratos was active at Delphi, where he consecrated a statue of Philadelphus and possibly of Arsinoe too, in Caunos, Athens and Cyrene, and he was helpful towards the Nesiotic League, for which he was made citizen of all the cities that made up the League.[95] The king of Sidon, Philokles, helped the Delians retrieve money from the Islanders, for which he

[93] Strabo 17.1.6. Mooren 1975, 56–57 no. 08.

[94] Strabo 17.1.6; Lucian *De historia conscribenda* 62 records part of the inscription as Σώστρατος Δεξιφάνους Κνίδιος θεοῖς σωτῆρσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν πλωιζομένων. For a reconstruction of Sostratos' dedication, see Bernand 1996 and Charvet and Yoyotte 1997, 239. Poseidippos' epigram on the Pharos seems to imply that Sostratos was responsible for the construction of the lighthouse: Gow and Page 1965 vol. 1, lines 3099–3109, esp. 3100–3101, and vol. 2, 489–491 (AB 115); Chamoux 1975; Thompson 1987.

[95] Dedication of a statue of Philadelphus at Delphi, to which may have been added a statue of Arsinoe: Amandry 1940–1941, 63–65 no. 3; Shear 1978, 23–25. Two decrees from Delphi honoured Sostratos: in the first one, Sostratos was honoured by the city of Delphi, while the second one was promulgated by the Amphyctionic council. Both decrees were inscribed on the Cnidian Treasure: cf. Fraser 1972 vol. 2, 50 n. 111 and 52–53 n. 121. A statue of Sostratos was erected by the demos of Caunos: *IG* XI.4 1130; *Choix* 23. In the Kallias decree, Sostratus is mentioned as Ptolemaic ambassador sent to Athens by Ptolemy I to negotiate peace terms with Demetrios on behalf of Athens (287 BC): *SEG* XXIX 102 line 34. Etearchos son of Damylos from Cyrene erected a statue of Sostratos of Cnidus for his *arete* and *eunoia* towards himself and the Cyrenaeans: *IG* XI.4 1190. A decree of the Islanders found on Delos (279–274 BC) honours Sostratos for his zeal towards king Ptolemy and his goodwill towards the

received outstanding honours, while the Ptolemaic nauarch Hermias founded a festival in honour of Arsinoe on Delos, the Philadelphia, and dedicated a phiale to the Delian triad on this occasion.[96] Glaukon played an instrumental role in the assertion of Philadelphus' policy of preservation of Greek traditional values. Many of the eponymous priests of the reign of Philadelphus, Kallikrates, Patroclos, Glaukon, or Aetos, had therefore carried important duties outside Egypt itself, showing that their proximity to the royal house entitled them to act as representatives of the king abroad, but also that their functions in Alexandria could not be separated from their function in the empire.[97] Several sons of Philadelphus were sent to sensitive areas and the confusion over their identity since they all shared the same name, is reflected in the royal policy that will inexorably attach the name of Ptolemy to all the kings of the dynasty.[98] Opposite the Sounion promontory near Athens the Ptolemaic official Patroklos left his name to a small island, the Island of Patroklos, after he fortified it and left an everlasting trace of the Ptolemaic *soteria*.[99] Even in the south of Egypt, expedition leaders, after founding Ptolemais or Arsinoe cities, gave their names to islands or promontories, and the boundaries of the empire were stressed with places such as the Village of Philon, the Island of Straton or the Altars of Conon.[100] This unconditional solidarity to the cause of Ptolemaic power, which was not only advertised in areas under Ptolemaic control, setting a striking example of loyalty to Philadelphus, but also in sanctuaries where events that were essential to the assertion

---

Islanders, for which he will be crowned during the next Ptolemaia on Delos. He will also become a citizen of all the islands which take part in the synedrion: *IG* XI.4 1038.

[96] Philokles: honoured by the Delians, *IG* XI.4 559; brought letters from Ptolemy to members of the League of the Islanders for acceptance of the Ptolemaia in Alexandria, *Syll.*[3] 390; sent *dikastai* to Samos, *SEG* I 363; accompanied soldiers to Aspendos, *SEG* XVII 639, Bagnall 1976, 111–113. Hermias: founded the Philadelpheia on Delos, *IG* XI.2 287 B lines 112ff.; *BCH* 32 (1908) 114–123; dedicated a phiale to the Delian triad: *IG* XI.2 287 B lines 112–115; 313 lines 63–65; 320 B lines 27–30.

[97] Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 222. Kallikrates, Patroklos, Glaukon, and Aetos respectively: Clarysse and van der Veken 1983, nos. 19 (272/1BC), 20 (271/0BC), 36 (255/4BC), and 94 (197/6BC). Kallikrates: Hauben 1970; Patroklos: Launey 1945; Glaukon: Etienne and Piérart 1975, Criscuolo 2003, 321–322; Aetos: Sosin 1997 and Criscuolo 1998.

[98] See n. 32 for the identity of the sons of Ptolemy.

[99] Pausanias 1.1.1.

[100] Strabo 16.4.5–10 and 17.26. Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 178. Strabo 16.4.9: 'Next to the altars of Conon is the port of Melinus, and above it is a fortress called that of Coraus and the chase of Coraus, also another fortress and more hunting-grounds. Then follows the harbour of Antiphilus, and above this a tribe, the Creophagi.'

of a Greek identity took place, is quite remarkable, and the policy was continued by Philadelphus' successors.[101] Philadelphus' ubiquitous policy of names shows that at the heart of any imperial ideology is not the reality of power but the 'sense' of power.

The recent discovery of more than a hundred epigrams of Posidippus sheds a new light on the visibility of Ptolemaic power in the Greek world in the reign of Philadelphus.[102] I am referring specifically to the section *Hippika*, and the participation of members of the Ptolemaic family and their entourage in the Panhellenic games of mainland Greece.[103] The poems particularly bring out the pride that the Ptolemies felt not only in winning such competitions but in being acknowledged, despite repeated claims to their Macedonian heritage, as part of a Hellenic cultural space. The other alternative is that the Ptolemaic king may not have completely succeeded. When Ptolemy IV endeavoured to overthrow the reputation of the invincible pugilist Cleitomachos, he gave intensive training to the athlete Aristonikos and sent him to Greece.[104] When Cleitomachos saw that the attendance was cheering Aristonikos he reminded them that Cleitomachos was fighting for the glory of the Greeks, and Aristonikos for that of king Ptolemy: "Did they prefer seeing an Egyptian winning the Olympic crown and triumphing over the Greeks, rather than hearing that a Boeotian from Thebes had won in the boxing contest?" Whether Aristonikos was Egyptian or not, the defiance towards royal power remained. When Philadelphus had his statue erected by Aristolaos at Olympia it was still clear that he had been competing for a king, not for the Hellenic cause.[105] The unusual efforts deployed by Philadelphus to spread the fame of his name and that of his family must also be understood in the context of this royal frustration, even more so when the remarkable attention given by Philadelphus to Greece hid a persistent desire to give supremacy to his own cultural capital, Alexandria.

---

[101] Marquaille 2001, 315–351.

[102] *P.Mil. Vogl.* VIII 309, Austin and Bastianini 2002, Acosta-Hughes and Kosmetatou 2004, Gutzwiller 2005.

[103] AB 71–88; Fantuzzi 2005.

[104] Polybius 27.9; Walbank 1979 vol. 3, 307–308.

[105] Pausanias 6.17.3.

Chronology

Year	*Military and diplomatic events*	*Religious events and gifts*
282–1	Beginning of the reign of Ptolemy II Ptolemy I becomes God Soter	
c.280		Philadelphus founds the Ptolemaia in Delos
280–79	Syrian War of Succession. Ptolemy acquires Samos, cities in Caria (Stratonikeia, Amyzon, Halikarnassus)	
280–79?	Ptolemy son of Lysimachus in Telmessos in Lycia	A temple of Ptolemy II is erected in Byzantion and divine honours to him instituted Ptolemy sends wheat to Herakleia
279–8	Ptolemy II in the Black Sea; sending of gifts and alliance with Byzantion	Nikouria Decree Festival of Ptolemaia in Alexandria
c.278?		Ptolemy II sends wheat to Sinopus and receives a statue of Sarapis in exchange for his gift
278–5	Magas takes the title of king in Cyrenaica …	
c.274	… and thereafter launches an unsuccessful attack against Egypt	Evidence for a priest of Ptolemy I in Lapethus
274–1	First Syrian War against Antiochos I	
273	Ptolemaic embassy in Rome	
270	Death of Arsinoe II	
269		Arsinoe II deified in Egypt
268/7	Alliance between Athens, Sparta and Ptolemy against Antigonos Gonatas to preserve *homonoia* and the freedom of the Greeks	
267–61	Chremonidean War. Patroklos cruises the Aegean with the Ptolemaic fleet and establishes long-term bases in Cretan Itanos, Thera, and Methana-Arsinoe	
c.262	Ptolemy II acquires Ephesus and perhaps Lesbos	
262/1?	Ptolemy II writes to the *boule* and *demos* of Miletus to remind them of their friendship and alliance	The Amphyctionic Council at Delphi accepts the invitation to the Ptolemaia

Year	*Military and diplomatic events*	*Religious events and gifts*
260–53	Second Syrian War against Antiochos II	
260/59	Ptolemy the son revolts in Ionia	
259/8	Antiochos recaptures Miletus and Samos	
255?	Battle of Kos Ptolemaic fleet is defeated by Antigonos	A Phoenician in Kition, Cyprus, is attested as canephor of Arsinoe Philadelphus
255/4	Antiochus captures Ephesus	
c. 254–3	Presumed end of the Ptolemaic protectorate over the League of the Islanders	
253	Miletus, Samos, Ephesus, Pamphylia and Cilicia become Seleucid after a peace treaty is concluded with Antiochos	
251/48	Diplomatic contacts with King Asoka of India	
250		Ptolemy founds the second Ptolemaia in Delos
250/49	Death of Magas Naval victory against Antigonos?	
249/8	Aratos, leader of Sikyon, in Alexandria to receive Ptolemaic help	
246	Death of Ptolemy II	

A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE CHREMONIDEAN WAR

James L. O'Neil

The Chremonidean War was an important event in the history of Greece in the third century BC, but like most of the history of the third century, it is extremely poorly documented. We have two very brief accounts of the war, in Pausanias 3.6.4–6 and Justin 26.2. Not only are these short, but both of them leave out important details and we have no reason to think that even combining the two of them can give a full account of the war. Other references do provide further details of the war. For example, Pausanias 1.36.4 tells us that Antigonos destroyed the shrine of Poseidon Hippios at Kolonos, outside Athens. This must have happened in the course of the Chremonidean War, but cannot be placed in any definite context in it.

This limited literary material does give us some clear impressions on the nature of the war. Pausanias 1.7.3 tells us that Ptolemy Philadelphos' admiral Patroklos came to rescue Athens, but failed to achieve anything worthwhile. This is supported by Pausanias' later account, in 3.6.5f., which says Patroklos requested Areus, king of Sparta, to make an attack on Antigonos' army, so that Patroklos' troops could then attack the Macedonians in the rear, but Areus did not do so, but instead retreated when his supplies ran out. None of the other literary evidence contradicts this impression of Egyptian ineffectiveness in the course of the Chremonidean War.

The literary evidence also gives the impression that this ineffective resistance to Antigonos' attempts to control Greece did not last for a very long period. J.J. Gabbert has recently taken another look at the literary evidence in an attempt to determine the dates of the war without going into the controversy over which years the archons at the beginning and end of the war held office. She concludes from it that the war cannot have lasted more than a few years.[1]

While the literary evidence on the Chremonidean War does not enable us to write a detailed history of it, inscriptions and archaeolog-

[1] Gabbert, 'Anarchic Dating', 230–235.

ical evidence have been discovered which add a considerable amount of new information on the war. It is still not possible to write a full and detailed account of the course of the war, but we can supplement and modify the conclusions reached from the literary evidence and bring to light certain aspects of the war which have been totally lost in the brief surviving historical evidence.

The most important inscription is the decree, moved by the Athenian politician Chremonides, from whom the war has received its name, which created the alliance between Athens and Sparta which led to the outbreak of the war. Several fragments of the decree have survived, and in *Syll.*[3] 434/5 we have the decree almost intact. It was passed in the second prytany of the archonship of Peithidemos, and it refers back to previous alliance between Athens and Sparta, when they opposed those trying to enslave Greece (line 7). In other words, the Chremonidean War is being compared to the war against Xerxes in the fifth century.

Ptolemy's role is mentioned, but the Athenian alliance with Sparta is presented as the significant factor. Yet the fact that both Athens and Sparta were already allied to Ptolemy before this decree was passed suggests that he was actually the instigator of the war.[2] Chremonides said that Ptolemy was motivated by his goodwill towards the Greeks and his concern for their freedom and that he was following the policy of his ancestors and his sister. This links Ptolemy to the theme of Athenian and Spartan resistance to the enslavement of Greece. However there are certain odd features of this formulation. Ptolemy Philadelphus had only one ancestor who had intervened in Greek politics, or even been in a position to have done so, his father Ptolemy Soter, who had indeed proclaimed his intention of freeing Greece when he arrived there in 309 BC; but when the Greek cities did not provide the financial and other support he demanded, Ptolemy had made peace with Kassandros and returned to Egypt (Diodorus Siculus 20.37.2.). Ptolemy's sister and wife Arsinoe's concern for Greek freedom is not attested before this, but since most of her monuments are posthumous,[3] this is not surprising. However it seems likely that her major interest in Greek affairs was the possibility of putting her son Ptolemy, by her first husband Lysimachos, on the throne of Macedon.[4]

---

[2] Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, 142 f.; Marasco *Sparta agli inizi dell'età Ellenistica*, 141.

[3] Hauben, 'Arsinoé II et la politique extérieure', 109.

[4] Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 170.

In actual fact, Ptolemy son of Lysimachos was not restored to the throne of Macedon, but in the end, his cousin Ptolemy III made him dynast of Telmessos, on the borders of Lykia and Caria, in 240 BC.[5] Chremonides' account of the reasons for the alliance seems to be more propaganda than a realistic account of Ptolemy's motives. This propaganda is echoed by the dedication made by Ptolemy at Delphi in honour of Areus, king of Sparta (*Syll.*[3] 433) which praises him for his efforts to free Greece. Chremonides' presentation of Ptolemy as a benefactor concerned for Greek freedom matches the way Ptolemy Philadelphos wished to present himself.

The alliance of Athens and Sparta is said to be an alliance of the two cities and their respective allies. However, the list of Greek cities given shows that they are all allies of Sparta, not Athens. They consist of the Eleans, the Achaians, quite a few Arcadian cities, and some Cretans (lines 23 ff. and 38 ff.).[6] The attempt to present the Chremonidean War as a re-enactment of the Persian Wars leads Chremonides to downplay Athens' current weakness and to emphasize the alliance of Athens and Sparta, rather than the support of Ptolemy. In fact, Ptolemaic support was probably vital for the Spartans as well as the Athenians. Analysis of the coins found in Hellenistic Sparta shows that Ptolemaic coins were most prominent precisely during the reign of King Areus, and disappear afterwards.[7] These coins are not more numerous than other coins found at Sparta at that time, so they do not show that Sparta was totally reliant on Ptolemaic money, but it does seem that Ptolemaic subsidies were an important factor in enabling the Spartans to field an army against Antigonos Gonatas at this time.

The Chremonidean decree also shows Areus playing a dominant role at Sparta, equalling or exceeding the other authorities, and even being mentioned without them (see lines 26, 28 f., 50, 90 f.). This matches other evidence on Areus' style of kingship. He was the first to strike coins in Sparta, which he struck, not in the name of the city, but his own, and on which he imitated the coins of Alexander.[8] Phylarchus[9] records that Areus and his son Akrotatos adopted a luxurious lifestyle. All this shows Areus as adopting a Hellenistic style of monar-

[5] *OGIS* 55; cf. 'Ptolemy (13)' RE 23 (1939), 1596; Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen II', 217.

[6] Cloché, 'Politique extérieure de Lacédémone', 48.

[7] Wace, 'Laconia: Excavations at Sparta 1906' 149–158.

[8] Head, *Historia Numorum*, 434; Troxell, 'Peloponnesian Alexanders', 73.

[9] Phylarchus *FGrHist* 81F44 = Athenaeus 4.141 f.

chy in Sparta, rather than a traditional Spartan one.[10] Once again, Chremonides' depiction of the alliance as a return to the values of classical Greece does not match the realities of the case.

The Chremonides decree has always raised the question of the reference to the wishes of Arsinoe Philadelphos, since her death, which has been regarded as one of the best established dates in the Hellenistic period, occurred, according to the Mendes Stele, in Pachom of the fifteenth year of the reign of Philadelphos, and has been taken to be 9 July 270 BC, which was definitely well before the start of the Chremonidean War. However, Erhard Grzybek has shown that, according to the Pithom stele, Arsinoe was still alive in Philadelphos' sixteenth year. It seems that at some point, Ptolemy Philadelphos changed the count of his years in Egyptian style: having first counted them from the death of his father, he then later also counted in the two years of his co-regency with his father. The Mendes Stele uses the first method, and the Pithom stele the second. Therefore, Arsinoe's death occurred, not in Pachom 271/0, but two years later in 269/8.[11]

Unfortunately, the date of the archonship of Peithidemos is not so certain. There is a blank space in the decree of Chremonides where the secretary's name should have been inscribed, and no other inscription from the year of Peithidemos supplies the missing secretary's name and deme, which would allow Peithidemos' place in the secretary cycle to be determined.

In recent years a consensus has grown up that Peithidemos can be securely dated to 265/4.[12] This date for Peithidemos still meets with support in a number of recent publications.[13] However, it has been challenged by Heinen, who points out that IG II^2 665 and 668, both dated to the archonship of Nikias Otryneus, show that Athens was in a state of war both in his archonship, 266/5 and in that of his predecessor, Menekles, 267/6. Both these archons are securely fixed by the secretary cycle, unlike Peithidemos. It is hard to see what this war could be, if it is not the Chremonidean War. In that case, Peithidemos must precede Menekles, and can be dated no later than 268/7.[14]

---

[10] Cartledge and Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta*, 35.

[11] Grzybek, *Du calendrier Macédonien au calendrier Ptolémaïque*, 103–107, 117; cf. Hauben, 'La chronologie macédonienne et ptolémaïque mise à l'épreuve', 160.

[12] See Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 228.

[13] E.g. Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 276, 288; Gabbert, 'Anarchic Dating', 230–235.

[14] Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 110ff., 116.

Dreyer has argued that the emergencies in the archonship of Nikias and the state of war attested for the end of the archonship of Menekles may have been only preliminary stages of the war, which did not formally start until the decree of Chremonides was passed early in 265/4.[15] But it seems unlikely that Antigonos was able to take measures against Athens at sometime in 267/6, which the Athenians saw as a state of war, while neither Ptolemy nor Areus of Sparta took any action to counter this for over a year. Heinen's arguments have been accepted by a number of recent authors,[16] and they seem persuasive.

However, Meritt has continued to defend his dating of the archonship of Peithidemos to 265/4.[17] He argues that an inventory of the priests of Asklepios (IG II^2 1534B) shows that Peithidemos' archonship started a secretary cycle, and this must have been in 265/4. He also believes that Diogeiton, whom he places in 268/7, and whose secretary comes from the tenth tribe in the cycle, Hippothontis, cannot be put anywhere else, since there are no vacant places for an archon with a secretary from Hippothontis within this general period, to which Diogeiton belongs. In that case, Peithidemos could not be redated to 268/7. However, neither of these arguments is decisive.

The individual Pe[……..] in IG II^2 1534B is probably an archon (and so Peithidemos) rather than a priest of Asklepios[18] (although most of the items on the inventory are dated by priests), since then the beginning and the end of the inventory would be dated by means of archons. However it is only an assumption that the inventories of the priests of Asklepios began and ended according to the secretary cycles.[19] This inventory preserves the names of eighteen priests, of whom two in succession come from the same tribe, Antiochis, with the second probably replacing the first within the same year.[20] So we have only evidence for seventeen years on the preserved parts of the inventory, and not proof that it covered two full tribal cycles of twelve years each.

---

[15] Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 301.

[16] Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, 148; Osborne, 'Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century', 228.

[17] Meritt, 'Mid-Third Century Athenian Archons', 78–99.

[18] As suggested by Osborne, 'Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century', 225.

[19] Osborne, 'Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century', 229 n. 93; for the assumption, see Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 6, cf. 19; Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, v, 31.

[20] Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 21; Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 31.

On the other hand, the periods which have been assigned to this inventory by the dating of the archons who begin and end it, are shorter than two full cycles.[21] Furthermore, Meritt initially argued that Peithidemos and the start of the secretary cycle must be placed in 267/6,[22] and later changed the date to 265/4 instead. If Peithidemos, who is not firmly linked to the secretary cycle, did stand at the start of one, he cannot immediately precede the archons Menekles and Nikias Otryneus, whose secretaries place them at the end of such a cycle. The assumption that the priestly inventories of Asklepios were started and ended with the secretary cycles does not seem to be supported strongly enough to warrant disregarding the evidence that Menekles and Nikias Otryneus were archons during the Chremonidean war, and so held office later than Peithidemos.

Nor is it safe to argue that the secretary cycle was an unchanging feature of Athenian life. It is not attested in any of our ancient sources, but it can be shown to have been in place where our evidence is good, and when Athens was under a completely democratic government. The idea of rotating the secretaryship around the tribes in a fixed order does seem to be democratic in its inspiration. We know that Athens was not under fully democratic rule after the end of the Chremonidean War, and it can be shown that the order of the secretary cycle was broken in the 250s.[23] It is therefore possible to place Diogeiton in one of the years in the 250s for which an archon is not known, and put Peithidemos in 268/7.

In fact, neither 270/69 nor 269/8 has an archon who is dated by the secretary cycle or by other clear evidence.[24] It does seem possible, therefore, that Peithidemos held office in one of those years, and that thus Arsinoe was still alive at the time she was mentioned in Chremonides' decree. Two points argue against this, although neither of them is deci-

[21] Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, xix–xxi, twenty years; Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 233 f., eighteen years; Meritt, 'Mid-Third Century Athenian Archons', 60, twenty one years. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 23 f. does have twenty four years for the period of this inventory, but he starts it with an archon P[olystratos?] in 276/5, distinct from, and earlier than, Peithidemos.

[22] Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, xix, 29.

[23] Osborne, 'Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century', 225. Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 29 ff. also conclude that there must have been a break in the secretary cycles.

[24] Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 233; Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 116; Osborne, 'Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century', 241; Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 428.

sive. As Heinen points out, the archonship of Peithidemos fits logically immediately before that of Menekles.[25] As we shall see, an earlier dating would create a long gap in the war between its outbreak and the death of Areus. Moreover, Meritt has shown that Peithidemos' year was probably an intercalary one. The years in this period which would normally be intercalary are 268/7 and 265/4, which Meritt uses to argue for the latter year.[26] The Athenians did not always have an intercalary year at the point in the Metonic cycle where it would be expected,[27] but it does seem to be the case that 268/7 fits the evidence for the archonship of Peithidemos somewhat better than an earlier year would.

If this is correct, Arsinoe had died a little less than two months before Chremonides proposed his decree.[28] Chremonides may not yet have been aware of Arsinoe's death, but it is more likely that he was presenting Arsinoe, like Ptolemy Soter, as an honoured relative, now deceased, whose praiseworthy policies Ptolemy Philadelphos was continuing. The policy of war with Antigonos Gonatas in Macedon could well have been inspired by Arsinoe. There is no longer a gap of several years between the inspiration and any action taken on it which requires to be explained. Nonetheless, if the war was Arsinoe's idea, she did not live to see its start, much less its outcome.

Another difficult problem with the Chremonidean War is the question of who was in possession of the Peiraieus during the war, the Athenians or Antigonos Gonatas. The fact that Ptolemy's admiral Patroklos made his base on a small barren island off the south coast of Attica near Sounion, which still bears his name (Pausanias 1.1.1; Strabo 9.1.21 [C395]), suggests that the Peiraieus was not available to him, and thus in Macedonian hands.[29] The continued presence of one of Demetrios' officers, Hierokles, in the Peiraieus both in the 280s and later under Antigonos Gonatas, suggests that the position had remained in Macedonian hands throughout the period.[30] However, this hypothesis does seem to contradict the evidence of Pausanias 1.26.3. Having mentioned Olympiodoros' recapture of the fort on the Mouseion Hill, Pausanias says it was his greatest achievement apart from his recovery of the Peiraieus. Pausanias then goes on to mention Olympiodoros' defence

[25] Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 116.
[26] Meritt, 'Athenian Dates by Month and Prytany', 255–256.
[27] Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 4f.
[28] Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, 13, Habicht, *Athens and the Ptolemies*, 72.
[29] Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens*, 101; Garland, *Piraeus*, 51f.
[30] Garland, *Piraeus*, 51; cf. O'Neil, 'Ethnic Origins of the Friends', 513f.

of Eleusis, and then, explicitly going back in time, refers to his embassy to the Aitolians asking for help against Kassandros. The recovery of the Peiraieus would seem to fall in the same period as his actions at the Mouseion Hill and Eleusis, and so to belong in the decade around 280.[31] In that case, we would expect the Peiraieus to have been still in Athenian hands at the start of the Chremonidean War.

This leaves Patroklos' failure to use Athens' principal port requiring explanation. Beloch argued that the Athenians must have forbidden the Ptolemaic fleet to use the Peiraieus for fear that Ptolemy would take the opportunity to seize the port for himself.[32] However, it seems unlikely that the Athenians would allow Ptolemy to persuade them to make war on Antigonos Gonatas, but then distrust him so much as to make the conduct of that war ineffective. Dreyer suggests that Antigonos Gonatas could have blockaded the Peiraieus at the beginning of the war, since he occupied much of Attica, and thus made it unusable by Patroklos.[33] In that case, it seems odd that Patroklos would not have made use of the port of the Peiraieus, even if Antigonos was blocking access from it to Athens itself, rather than basing himself on Gardonisi.

All in all, it seems unlikely that the Peiraieus was in Athenian hands at the start of the war. Habicht's argument that Olympiodoros' saving of the Peiraieus must have been an earlier event (like his embassy to the Aitolians) seems the least difficult solution to the problem.[34] This means that the Athenians would not have recovered the Peiraieus in the 280s or 270s after the disastrous failure of their attempt to capture Mounychia by treachery in this period (Polyaenus 5.7 [1]).

Although the Athenians' position at the start of the war was weak, since their port was in the hands of their enemy, they nevertheless were active against him beyond their borders. In 1971, an inscription of the common synedrion of the Greeks was found at Plataia, honoring the Athenian Glaukon son of Eteokles.[35] Now this Glaukon is clearly the brother of Chremonides, who like him took service with Ptolemy after Athens' defeat in the war (cf. Teles Περὶ φυγῆς 23H). The decree praises

[31] Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 72 f.

[32] Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte IV2*, 453.

[33] Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 354.

[34] Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens*, 103. The suggestion of Ferguson *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 73 that Antigonos had forced Athens to surrender the Peiraieus seems less likely.

[35] Etienne and Piérart, 'Décret des Koinon des Hellènes', 51–75; Buraselis, Γλαύκων Ἐτεοκλέους, 136–166.

Glaukon for his goodwill towards the Greeks and his adornment of the images of the shrine, both while he was still living at Athens and later, when he was serving with Ptolemy. That is to say, he supported the cults at Plataia, not only as an exile serving with Ptolemy, but at an earlier time, either before the war or after its outbreak.[36]

The language of the Plataian decree for Glaukon reminds us of Chremonides' decree proposing the alliance between Athens and Sparta and other Athenian information from this period. The cults honoured at Plataia by Glaukon are Zeus Eleutherios, Homonoia and the heroes of the Persian Wars. On honours to Zeus Eleutherios we may compare those for the men who died in the seizure of the Mouseion Hill (Pausanias 1.26.3). Homonoia was a goddess who cannot have been created before the fourth century, since the word is first found in the late fifth,[37] and she may have been created in the Hellenistic period, perhaps during the Celtic invasion of Greece, which the Athenians claimed to have played a major role in repelling.[38] Finally, the parallels with the Gallic invasion, with barbarians being fought at Thermopylae, were stronger for the Celtic threat than that posed by Antigonos Gonatas, and the elaboration of these cults fits better in the earlier period.

Chremonides' decree, with its stress on Greek freedom, on homonoia among the Greeks, and the parallels drawn with the Persian Wars, shows the same propaganda motifs as the decree for Glaukon. This honorary decree for Glaukon, even though it was enacted well after the end of the Chremonidean War when he was serving with Ptolemy, shows that the same ideas were still being used, and presumably they resonated with the wider Greek public. It is unfortunate that we cannot tell whether Glaukon's activity at Plataia took place before the outbreak of Athens' war with Antigonos or during its early stages, but it does seem clear that the Athenians thought that they would be able to organise opposition to Antigonos beyond their northern borders.

It is doubtful how far such action may have presented a threat to Antigonos. Since Glaukon was able to continue to serve the cults of Zeus Eleutherios, Homonoia and the heroes of the Persian Wars even after the defeat of Athens, it seems that Antigonos did not seek to

---

[36] Etienne and Piérart, 'Décret des Koinon des Hellènes', 70f.; Buraselis, Γλαύκων Ἐτεοκλέους, 138.

[37] Etienne and Piérart, 'Décret des Koinon des Hellènes', 71ff.

[38] Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 254.

prevent Glaukon's participation in this religious activity at Plataia, even though it was in area of Greece where he did have control. It may be that he felt the effects of preventing pious activity were worse than those of allowing it to continue, but it is unlikely that the comparison of Antigonos to Xerxes had no effect on his reputation. At the start of the war, the Athenians were optimistic about their chances of defeating Antigonos with the help of their allies and hoped to exert influence against him north of Kithairon.

Archaeological evidence also shows that the allied efforts to come to Athens' defense were not as weak as Pausanias' evidence leads us to believe. Ptolemy's admiral Patroklos was based on Gardonisi, the island which took his name. Excavations on the site have produced pottery which would otherwise have been dated to the end of the fourth century. But since this camp must be that of Patroklos, the pottery must, in fact be dated some thirty years later.[39] Similar pottery found at other sites in southeastern Attica may also be dated to the same period, the Chremonidean War, especially where coins of Ptolemy Philadelphos have also been found at these sites. It seems that Patroklos was more active in his attempts to assist Athens than Pausanias' words would suggest. Patroklos' actions may have been ineffective in the end, but it was not for want of trying.

A fort on the coast to the north of Patroklou Charax, in the deme of Atene is to be dated at the same period.[40] Clearly this formed a forward defence for the main base on the island and shows that Patroklos was prepared to defend and hold positions on the mainland, even though his army was not strong enough to advance to Athens itself to meet Antigonos Gonatas in battle. We do not have direct evidence on who held Sounion at this time, but the fact that Patroklos based himself on an off-shore island suggests that it was still garrisoned by the Macedonians.[41] Patroklos may have neutralised the Macedonian position at Sounion by his local superiority of numbers, rather than by removing it.

A second major fort was located at Koroni, on a peninsula in a large bay on the south east coast of Attica. This cannot be a fortress built to defend the local population for two reasons. The fort provides little access to the mainland, its entrances largely face the sea, and

[39] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 9–25.
[40] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 25.
[41] Habicht, *Athenian Year*, 130.

the remains of habitation cover only a small period. The pottery is similar in date to that from Patroklou Charax and coins of Ptolemy Philadelphos are the most common on the site.[42] Koroni could have served as a base from which to send supplies to Athens by a route which did not pass near the Antigonid troops in the Peiraieus. Coins of Ptolemy Philadelphos found at Markopoulou,[43] on the road from Koroni to Athens, may well be evidence for Ptolemaic supplies sent to Athens along this road.

Patroklos' forces also advanced towards Athens along the western side of the Akti. There are remains from this period at Vouliagmeni,[44] possibly protecting the bays and beaches near the peninsula, to safeguard the landing of troops or supplies there. Further north, at Helioupolis, in the low hills west of Hymettos and looking down towards Athens itself, there was a camp, which can be identified by its coins as belonging to this period. There are two gold coins and forty-five silver coins of Ptolemy II, which outnumber all the other coins found on the site taken together.[45] Finally, there was a Hellenistic fortification on Mt. Hymettos, which cannot be clearly dated by coins or pottery. However, it seems to have been intended as a watch-post for some other position outside the city of Athens, and it is probable that it was intended to serve this function for the camp at Helioupolis.[46] Overall, the archaeological evidence shows that Patroklos pushed his troops further into Attica than Pausanias realised, but, as Pausanias 3.6.5 says, he was relying on Areus and the Spartans to open the attack and planned to join in with an attack from the rear once Areus had engaged the Macedonians. The camp at Helioupolis would be the base from which he planned to advance against Antigonos, and the fort on Hymettos, with its wider views of the area around Athens, would have told him when such an advance was possible.

Inscriptional evidence shows that the Athenians themselves were guarding the north-eastern part of Attica. An honorary decree for Epichares, the general over the country and the coast, was set up at

---

[42] Vanderpool, McCredie and Steinberg, 'Koroni, a Ptolemaic Camp', 26–60; Vanderpool, McCredie and Steinberg, 'Koroni, the Date', 69–75.

[43] Varucha-Christodoulopoulou, Συμβολὴ εἰς τὸν Χρεμωνίδειον πόλεμον, 328.

[44] Varucha-Christodoulopoulou, Συμβολὴ εἰς τὸν Χρεμωνίδειον πόλεμον, 322, McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 30.

[45] Varucha-Christodoulopoulou, Συμβολὴ εἰς τὸν Χρεμωνίδειον πόλεμον, 322–326, cf. McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 46.

[46] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 48 ff.

Rhamnous (SEG 24.154). It was passed in the archonship of Peithidemos, the first year of the war, and honours Epichares for having protected the farmers bringing in the crops in the vicinity and having arranged the ransom for citizens who had been kidnapped by pirates. Since it was possible to arrange for their ransom even while the war was raging, it seems unlikely that these pirates were some of the Macedonian ships which Pausanias 3.6.4 mentions among the forces with which Antigonos invaded Attica. It seems more likely that pirates acting on their own initiative took advantage of Antigonos' invasion to ravage Attica on their own account, and they may well have received some assistance from within Attica itself.[47] Between them, Patroklos and the Athenians provided protection to the southern and eastern coasts of Attica, though it is clear that this protection was not totally effective.

We have some information on the western parts of Attica. Demochares was praised for organising the recapture of Eleusis ([Plutarch] *Moralia* 851F). Since this is mentioned immediately after his embassy to the short-reigned Antipatros the Etesian, it must have been sometime in the late 280s.[48] Pausanias 1.26.1 shows that Olympiodoros blocked a Macedonian attempt to recapture Eleusis later in this period, so it would seem that it was still held by the Athenians in 268/7. We have no information on the two forts on the northwest frontiers of Attica, Phyle and Panakton. Presumably they were included among the forts which the Athenians still hoped to recapture in 287/6, when they passed a decree in honour of Philippides the comic playwright (*Syll.*[3] 374). It has been conjectured that they did return to Athenian control some time around 280, but there is no evidence either way on this conjecture.[49]

However, these forts on the northern frontier of Attica were even more important for Antigonos Gonatas if he hoped to regain control of Athens than Eleusis and Rhamnous, which were not under Macedonian control at the start of the Chremonidean War, since Panakton and Phyle would have opened the way into invade Attica, and their loss made it hard to reinforce the Peiraieus except by sea. If the Athenians had recovered these two forts when Antigonos was at his weakest, they might have done so when they were receiving help from Antipatros the

[47] Oliver, 'Regions and Micro-Regions', 147.

[48] See Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 145 for the date.

[49] In favour: Ferguson *Hellenistic Athens*, 155, 162 n. 2, however the inscription he cites from Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. (1896), 33, refers to a demesman from Phyle, not to the fortress; absence of evidence, Habicht, *Athenian Year*, 129 (though at 137 Habicht thinks they were in Athenian hands), Dreyer, *Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen*, 223.

Etesian, the last time the Athenians could plausibly have recovered the Peiraieus.[50] However if Demochares' appeal for help from the kings had led to the recovery of any of these places, it is surprising that it was not mentioned alongside his role in the recovery of Eleusis. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is better to assume that Antigonos had kept control of Panakton and Phyle.

It does seem that the Macedonians held the island of Salamis continuously from 295 to 229 BC.[51] This would mean that Athenian ability to protect the western part of Attica, with Macedonian forces on Salamis and most probably at Panakton and Phyle, would have been even weaker than their position in the east and south. With the Macedonians holding the Peiraieus and Antigonos' army being in the central Attic plains, both in order to lay siege to the city and, as we shall see, to keep the armies trying to relieve Athens from joining together, Athens' ability to protect that area would have been minimal. The Athenians and their allies do seem to have been able to protect the Attic countryside more than our literary sources suggest, but even so Athenian agriculture must have been badly disrupted by the war.

There remain to be considered a number of archaeological sites of a military nature which belong to this period. They are in north central Attica, and the most important is a wall, which extends from the northern side of Mt. Aigaleon to the south of Parnes and is built to block access from the Thriasian plain to central Attica, and apparently it was only in use for a short time. It is known today as the Dema Wall.[52] The first modern report on it dated it to the end of the fourth century, and the authors suggested it was part of a plan for last-ditch defence of Attica after Chaironeia.[53] Such a date presents problems, since it is unclear why the Athenians would have abandoned Eleusis and the Thriasian plain, and how they planned to prevent Philip outflanking them through Aphidna. Nor does it seem likely they had time to build such a wall before they discovered that Philip was willing to offer acceptable terms.

However, as we saw in the case of Patroklou Charax, a late fourth century date for the pottery could also suit a date in the Chremonidean War. James McCredie argues that it was built by Antigonos to block

[50] Dreyer, *Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen*, 271.
[51] Habicht, *Athenian Year*, 130, cf. Dreyer, *Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen*, 168.
[52] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 63.
[53] Jones, Sackett and Eliot, 'TO DEMA', 152–187.

Areus' advance from the west, and the Dema Wall, located within Attica is a better fit for Pausanias' information (3.6.5) that Antigonos blocked the forces of Athens' allies τῆς εἰσόδου τῆς εἰς τὴν πόλιν, than the Isthmus of Corinth would be.[54]

There are two other fortifications in this general area, which also belong in this time frame. One is on a low hill in front of the Dema Wall, which McCredie calls 'the Lager'. This seems to have been held by a force opposing the garrison of the Dema Wall,[55] which does not fit the situation after Chaironeia, since Philip of Macedon did not invade Attica, but could well be the base from which Areus confronted Antigonos' troops on the Dema Wall. The second is a rough fortification in Kamatero, on the southern slopes of Aigaleon, close to the eastern end of the mountain. This position, built around this time, suggests that the Dema Wall was, in fact turned, and that Areus' army did enter the central Attic plain.[56]

This also makes more sense of Patroklos' request that Areus attack Antigonos' forces, so that Patroklos could then attack the Macedonians in the rear (Pausanias 3.6.5). If Patroklos were in Attica, while Areus was blocked at the Isthmus of Corinth, it would be hard for them to make a coordinated attack on the Macedonians. However, if Patroklos was at Helioupolis, to the south of Athens, while Areus was to the north of it at Kamatero, this may well have seemed a feasible strategy. But it seems that the gap between the two armies was still too great. Antigonos possessed the internal lines, with forces in the Peiraieus and a field army somewhere near Athens, and he was able to prevent the three allies, Patroklos, Areus and the Athenians from joining their forces. Areus apparently did not advance beyond Kamatero and when his supplies were running low, he retreated from Attica (Pausanias 3.6.6).

McCredie has suggested, as one possibility, that Areus and his army had evaded the Macedonian position at Corinth by being ferried across the Saronic Gulf by Patroklos' ships.[57] It is hard to see why Areus would have landed at Eleusis, if he were brought by the Egyptian navy, instead of landing in southern Attica, where he would not have been separated

[54] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 110f., Marasco, *Sparta agli inizi dell'età Ellenistica*, 148.
[55] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 70.
[56] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 72.
[57] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 111.

from his ally's forces by the Dema Wall and Antigonos' army. There is also the problem that Antigonos had attacked Athens with land forces and ships (πεζῷ καὶ ναυσίν, Pausanias 3.6.4). While Patroklos does seem to have had the advantage over Antigonos at sea, he might have lost it if his ships were used to transport Areus' army and Antigonos' ships had attacked the Egyptians while they were so burdened.[58]

It seems more likely that Areus had entered Attica by land. McCredie suggests the alternative that Areus may have slipped past the Isthmus fortifications.[59] It also seems possible that Antigonos had not blocked the Isthmus at the start of the war in 268/7. We know, from Plutarch *Agis* 3.4 and Trogus' prologue to book 26, that Areus died at Corinth, and Diodoros 20.29.1, tells us that Areus succeeded his father Kleomenes II in 309/8 and reigned for forty four years. This indicates that he died in 265/4. However, while these two pieces of evidence put together show that Areus died in 265/4 while trying to force the Isthmus, they do not prove that Antigonos had secured it against passage from the south in 268/7.

Archaeological traces remain of two walls in this area which were in use in this period. The first lies south of the Isthmus itself, but does not include Corinth in its line. This wall was built to block forces coming from the north and can hardly have been used to stop Areus who was coming from the south. It was probably built to stop the Celts if they had broken past Thermopylae.[60] The second wall is part of a line of fortifications further south still, which use Mount Oneion, the Acrocorinth and the long walls to Lechaion, to block movement in either direction past Corinth. It was originally built in an unsuccessful attempt to stop the Thebans entering the Peloponnese in the 360s and there are traces of reoccupation in the early third century, which suit its use to block Areus.[61]

Ronald Stroud suggests that Areus had found his retreat from Attica blocked by Antigonos' troops at the Isthmus fortifications and that he had died while unsuccessfully trying to force a passage southwards.[62] However, this conclusion rests on the assumption that the archonship of Peithidemos fell in 265/4, the same year that Areus died. As we have

[58] Marasco, *Sparta agli inizi dell'età Ellenistica*, 150.
[59] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 111.
[60] Wiseman, 'Trans-Isthmian Fortification Wall', 248–275.
[61] Stroud, 'Ancient Fort in Mount Oneion', 127–145.
[62] Stroud, 'Ancient Fort in Mount Oneion', 143f.

seen, it was almost certainly several years earlier. It seems more likely then, that Areus made several campaigns to assist Athens, and that in his first expedition he did not find the Isthmus line of fortification blocked, but did succeed in advancing into Attica, only to find himself unable to co-operate effectively with Patroklos. In later years of the war Antigonos would seem to have blocked the Isthmus line in order to make any such co-operation even less possible.[63]

Before Areus' defeat and death in 265/4 there was an episode which is not fully described in any of our sources. Antigonos was confronted with, and defeated, a force of Gauls. Justin 26.2.1 says that Antigonos was confronted with a new enemy, an army of Gallograeci. He left a token force to keep his other enemies from following him and when he attacked these Gallograeci they turned their arms on themselves and slaughtered their wives and children before killing themselves. Trogus in the prologue to book 26, the source from which Justin is drawing, says that Gauls at Megara defected from Antigonus and then mentions the death of Areus. Justin, in his epitome, has left out the detail that the 'enemy' was in fact a rebellious ally of the Macedonians.

There is an inscription from Maroneia, on the north coast of the Aegean, of a Gaul named Bricco, who apparently died there.[64] Bricco has a good Gallic name and his epitaph says he was the son of Ateuristos, his home was Apameia and he led a force of Galatians to fight in the front rank against Areus and the force had all gone to Hades. Bricco's epitaph supports Trogus in saying that the Gauls came to fight Areus, but gives the impression that they had died in carrying out this duty, rather than in rebellion against their paymaster.

The epitaph also provides new information. As a citizen of Apameia, Bricco must have come from Asia Minor, where he must have become integrated to some degree into the Greek community there. It seems probable that he led his Galatians from Asia Minor, rather than recruiting them from somewhere in the Balkans, although their subsequent mass-suicide makes it unlikely they were also hellenised to any extent. A hellenised Gaul with citizenship in Apameia can hardly have been recruiting a force of Gauls in Asia Minor for Antigonos without at least the tacit approval of the Seleucid king.[65]

---

[63] See Walbank in Hammond and Walbank, *History of Macedonia* vol. 3, 282.
[64] Welles, 'Gallic Mercenaries in the Chremonidean War', 471–490.
[65] Welles 'Gallic Mercenaries in the Chremonidean War', 485.

There is further evidence on this campaign. Two sources, Polyaenus 4.6.3 and Aelian *Natura Animalium* 11.4 and 16.36, inform us that when Antigonos was attacking Megara with elephants, the Megarians frightened the elephants by sending out pigs which had been greased and set on fire. Antigonos tried to combat this tactic for the future by accustoming his elephants to the presence of pigs. Now the only war in which Antigonos can have had elephants and attacked Megara is the Chremonidean War.[66] Moreover, the elephants, like the Gauls, would seem to have come from Asia Minor, and are even stronger evidence for Seleucid support for Antigonos in this war. In addition, we should note that neither Polyaenus nor Aelian mentions Gauls, but only Megarians. It seems unlikely that they have both made the same mistake and it is probable that there was not only a mutiny of Antigonos' Gallic force at Megara but also a rebellion by the Megarians themselves.

Now McCredie suggests that the Gallic revolt occurred while Areus was retreating past Megara after his supplies ran out at Athens and that the Gauls may have expected help from Areus which was not forthcoming.[67] But this hypothesis rests on McCredie's acceptance of the date of 265/4 for Peithidemos, and it also fails to explain Justin's remark (26.2.1) that Antigonos left a covering force to block his other enemies while he advanced against the Gauls. If Areus was close to Megara when the Gauls revolted, it is hard to see how Antigonos could have advanced on Megara while deceiving Areus that the Macedonian army was still at Athens.[68]

It seems unlikely, then, that the Gallic revolt occurred in the first year of the war. Instead, it is more likely that in 267/6 Areus invaded Attica from the west, but was unable to make a junction with Patroklos, whose army was in the south of Attica. In the next year, 266/5, the Gallic force and the elephants probably arrived from Asia Minor,[69] and Antigonos may have blocked the Isthmus passage. However, if Antigonos was planning to strike a major blow against any of his existing enemies, the revolt of the Gallograeci and of the Megarians frustrated him. In 265/4 Areus attempted to force the Isthmus lines,

[66] Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 236 n. 28.
[67] McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps*, 112.
[68] Marasco, *Sparta agli inizi dell'età Ellenistica*, 151.
[69] Walbank in Hammond and Walbank, *History of Macedonia* vol. 3, 252; Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 201.

but died in battle at Corinth. It seems likely that Antigonos had concentrated his forces against the Spartans in this year.

Unfortunately, it is not clear in which half of each of these archon years these actions took place. Since there is a surprising gap between the death of Areus and the eventual fall of Athens,[70] it seems likely to me that Areus died in the opening months of the campaigning season of 264, than in mid 265. If that is the case, then Areus' invasion of Attica and Patroklos' concurrent occupation of the southern part of the country probably occurred at the start of 266. It is quite possible that Areus or Patroklos found it too difficult to organise his forces in time to get in the field in late 267, though it is surprising that Antigonos failed to take advantage of such a delay.

At least one more problem prevented Antigonos Gonatas from concentrating on Athens after the defeat and death of Areus. Justin 26.2.9–11 tells us that Alexander king of Epirus, being anxious to avenge the death of his father Pyrrhos, invaded Macedon and ravaged its borders. Antigonos thought this threat sufficiently serious to return with his army to Macedon to face it. However his son Demetrios (or the Macedonian nobles under the nominal leadership of Demetrios) had counter-attacked and not only driven Alexander out of Macedon, but even expelled him for a time from his own kingdom of Epirus. In view of Pyrrhos' past connection with the house of Ptolemy, it seems likely that Ptolemy Philadelphos had encouraged Alexander's attack on Macedon,[71] and possibly had subsidised it, just as he had subsidised king Areus of Sparta.

It is probably in this context that the story in Polyaenus 4.6.20 belongs.[72] This says that Antigonos made peace with the Athenians in autumn, which encouraged the Athenians to sow their stocks of corn, in the expectation of raising a harvest under cover of the peace. However, when the crop was nearly ripe, Antigonos returned and prevented the Athenians from harvesting it, leaving them no alternative to surrender. Polyaenus sees this as a deliberate attempt by Antigonos to trick the Athenians into using up reserves of seed for a harvest they would never gather, and making a specious peace to encourage them to do this. However, Justin suggests that Antigonos thought the threat from Alexander was more severe than it turned out to be, and that he would

[70] Walbank in Hammond and Walbank, *History of Macedonia* vol. 3, 285.
[71] Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 180.
[72] Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 181.

need to return with his army to Macedon in order to face it. Under these circumstances Antigonos' offer of peace, or perhaps only a truce, to enable him to cope with the more serious threat may well have been genuine, and not an attempt to deceive the Athenians. But when the Epirote threat turned out to have been overestimated, Antigonos either broke his truce, or returned sooner than the Athenians had calculated he could, and so reduced Athens' ability to hold out against him. The withdrawal of Antigonos' army may have made it possible to sow crops close to Athens for the first time in some years, but unfortunately for the Athenians they were unable to gather the harvest.

There are two other military campaigns which have been suggested to belong in this later part of the Chremonidean War. One is the battle of Akrotatos, son of Areus, against Aristodemos the tyrant of Megalopolis, in which Akrotatos was defeated and killed (Plutarch *Agis* 3.5), as his father had been at Corinth in 265/4. This battle is not clearly dated, and there could have been a long interval between Areus' death and that of his son Akrotatos,[73] but it must have been before 252 BC.[74] One possibility is that Akrotatos was trying to carry on his father's work by attacking the tyrant of Megalopolis,[75] who was probably an ally of the Macedonians since Megalopolis was not one of the Arkadian cities listed in the decree of Chremonides among the allies of king Areus.

Now it is unlikely that Akrotatos thought that he could force his way past the line of the Isthmus when his father, who presumably had a much larger army, had failed, since Areus would not have been the only Spartan casualty and his allies are likely to have abandoned the war with his death.[76] However, Akrotatos may have hoped to force Antigonos to withdraw troops from Athens to defend his Arcadian ally, just as Alexander of Epirus' attack did temporarily make him withdraw, or to take advantage of Antigonos' occupation elsewhere to attack his ally.[77] Continued military action by their friends, or at least by enemies of Antigonos, may well have encouraged the Athenians to think that the war was not yet lost beyond all hope. However, Ptolemaic support

[73] Cloché, 'Politique extérieure de Lacédémone', 53.

[74] Neise, 'Akrotatos (2)' *RE* 1 (1984), 1208. Tarn, 'Arcadian League and Aristodemos', 104 f. argues for a date early in Aristodemos' career.

[75] David, *Sparta between Empire and Revolution*, 139; Hicks, *Spartan Foreign Relations*, 20.

[76] Marasco, *Sparta agli inizi dell'età Ellenistica*, 156.

[77] Cloché, 'Politique extérieure de Lacédémone', 54.

seems to have been confined, in the last years of the war, as in the earlier stages, to financial support for his allies and naval assistance.

It remains unclear why Ptolemy did not send more effective soldiers to help Athens than the Egyptian sailors mentioned in Pausanias 3.6.5. The presence of Antigonos' ships could well have discouraged Patroklos from using his warships to transport land forces by sea, but surely Ptolemy could have supplied other shipping for a land army to support Athens which the superior Egyptian navy could then have protected from Antigonos' ships. Ptolemy does seem to have had some problems in Asia Minor at this time, since an inscription from 262 BC praises the Milesians for their loyalty to the Ptolemaic dynasty when under attack.[78] However, the major conflict between Ptolemy and Antiochos II, which we call the Second Syrian War, does not seem to have broken out until some time after the end of the Chremonidean War.[79] It is even possible that the forces attacking Miletos were associated with Antigonos,[80] and whoever they were, it seems unlikely that they presented a threat to Ptolemy which would justify his keeping his land forces away from the Greek theatre of war.

One other reason which may have led Ptolemy to keep his army at home is the battle of Kos, which has sometimes been dated to the last stages of the Chremonidean War.[81] The date of this battle is a notorious problem of chronology. We know that Antigonos Gonatas defeated the navy led by Ptolemy's commanders at Kos, but our sources tell us practically nothing about the battle or its context. Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* 5.46 209E tells us that Antigonos dedicated his victorious trireme to Apollo, presumably at Delos, after the battle, and Plutarch *Moralia* 545B[82] says that Antigonos, when told that his force was outnumbered by the enemy ships, responded by asking how many ships he himself was worth. Neither of these brief passages gives any indication of when the battle was fought. All we can say for certain is that it must have been after Patroklos had dominated the sea during the Chremonidean War.

Ferguson argued that it must have been some years after that war, since our sources for it could not have failed to mention such an

[78] Bevan, *House of Ptolemy*, 68 f.
[79] Hölbl, *History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, 44, cf. Bevan *House of Ptolemy*, 69.
[80] Bringmann, 'The King as Benefactor', 19.
[81] Cf. David, *Sparta between Empire and Revolution*, 139.
[82] Cf. Plutarch *Moralia* 183C–D, which tells the same story, without mentioning Kos.

important event if it took place during the war.[83] However, these sources are too defective for such an argument to be conclusive. Heinen took the story of Patroklos taunting Antigonos for his lack of control over the sea, with a gift of figs and fish (Phylarchus *FGrHist* 81F1), to show that Antigonos did realise he had to gain naval predominance to win the war, and therefore dates the battle of Kos around the end of it.[84] While the battle of Kos may well have been Antigonos' response to the problems which Ptolemaic control of the sea had caused him in the Chremonidean War, Antigonos did not need sea power to starve out Athens while he held the Peiraieus and the countryside round the city and the battle of Kos may still have come after that war. Our evidence for the date of the battle is almost non-existent, but we should note that Antigonos' influence does not seem to have spread into the Aegean before about 255 BC, and an earlier dating of the battle of Kos to around 262 will cause problems with the evidence for Delos being at peace in that year.[85]

We are left with the conclusion that Ptolemy Philadelphos does not seem to have been prevented by strategic considerations from sending more than naval forces to assist Athens. Perhaps he chose not to take the risk of his troops being defeated where it might have proved difficult to evacuate them, or to leave his other frontiers open to attack by the Seleucids while he had significant land forces in Greece. The Second Syrian War did break out a few years after the end of the Chremonidean War, and Antiochos does seem to have helped Antigonos with Galatian troops and elephants, so the possibility that he would have taken advantage of Ptolemaic pre-occupation in Greece does seem a real risk. Nevertheless, Ptolemy does not seem to have given winning the Chremonidean War as high a priority as his Athenian and Spartan allies, or his Macedonian antagonist Antigonos, did. We cannot tell how far Antigonos' victory in the sea battle at Kos was due to his presence there, but Ptolemy's relatively low interest in winning the Chremonidean War, in contrast with Antigonos' leadership on the spot, may well have been a major factor in Antigonos' victory.

The date of the end of the war is relatively securely fixed, even though neither Antipatros, the archon under whom Athens was forced

---

[83] Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 180 n. 2.

[84] Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 191.

[85] Hölbl, *History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, 44; Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 416 f.

to surrender, nor his successor, Arrheneides,[86] have a known secretary so that they can be placed in the secretary cycle. However we know that the philosopher Zeno died in the archonship of Arrheneides, and he had been head of the Stoic school for thirty nine years and three months, starting in the archonship of Klearchos (301/0).[87] Unfortunately this information has not led to certainty in the dating of Arrheneides' archonship, and thus the end of the Chremonidean War. William Dinsmoor thought that Antipatros was most probably archon in 263/2 and Arrheneides in 262/1, while allowing the following years to be possible in each case.[88] Heinen believes 262/1 and 261/0 are the most probable dates for these archons, while not completely ruling out one year later for each of them.[89] These two dates, 262/1 for Antipatros and 261/0 for Arrheneides, seem to have gained general acceptance.[90]

In that case, the war ended in 262/1, and since Antigonos made his delusive peace in autumn, his unexpected return must be placed in the spring of the following campaigning season. If the Athenians did not surrender immediately upon the destruction of their crops, but held out for some months, that surrender could have fallen early in the archon year 262/1 and Alexander of Epirus' invasion of Macedon and Antigonos' return in the following campaigning season would have taken place during the archon year 263/2. This leaves a gap of one year between Areus' defeat and death in 265/4 and Alexander's invasion of Macedon in 263/2. Either the Athenians had sufficient supplies to hold out for two years, even after the losses they must have suffered in the earlier part of the Chremonidean War, or else the events of a whole campaigning season have been lost.

As we have seen, both Patroklos and king Areus were more active in their efforts to relieve Athens than the literary sources suggest, and they initially enjoyed a measure of success. All the same, they did not succeed in the long run and it does not seem that Ptolemy Philadelphos was as committed to winning the Chremonidean war as was his Macedonian antagonist Antigonos Gonatas. The war proved disastrous

---

[86] Philodemos Περὶ τῶν Στωϊκῶν 3 = Apollodoros *FGrHist* 244F44.

[87] Philodemos Περὶ τῶν Στωϊκῶν 4; cf. Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 222.

[88] Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, 46–50, and *Athenian Archon List*, 37, 47.

[89] Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 184f.

[90] Meritt, 'Mid-Third Century Athenian Archons', 94; Osborne, 'Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century', 229, 241. However, Dreyer, *Geschichte des Spätklassischen Athen*, 429 merely indicates the two archons must belong between 263/2 and 261/0.

for Athens and Sparta and was a setback for Ptolemaic diplomacy in Greece.[91] Ptolemy did strengthen his position in the Aegean as a result of Patroklos' establishment of naval bases there,[92] but the enmity created with Antigonos led to the battle of Kos and the Ptolemaic loss of hegemony in the Aegean.

What does this tell us about Ptolemy's kingship and his effectiveness as a king? The decree of Chremonides stresses Ptolemy's goodwill towards the Greeks and his actions as their benefactor, particularly in defending their freedom against Antigonos. The image of the king as a benefactor was an important part of the ideology of Hellenistic kingship, with the benefits he gave not only conferring majesty on him, but also power over those he had benefited, since they were expected to repay the king for his help by supporting him in turn. This ideology of the benefactor applied both to the king's friends, his officers within the kingdom and to his allies, the cities which were, at least in theory, outside it. In both cases the role of benefactor was expected to bring positive benefits to the king.[93]

Ptolemy Philadelphos was conferring freedom on those Greeks of the mainland who did not want to co-operate with the Macedonians, not just to win their good will, but also to serve his own purposes. By weakening the power of Macedon within Greece, Ptolemy reduced the ability of Antigonos to strike at Ptolemaic possessions elsewhere, and also made sure that Antigonos could not prevent Ptolemaic recruitment of Greeks as soldiers and administrators for his kingdom. Royal benevolence could be used to mask other purposes,[94] but this does not mean that Ptolemy was insincere in wishing to be the benefactor and defender of freedom for the Greeks. What it does mean is that Ptolemy Philadelphos would pursue those roles only in so far as doing so protected his own interests. Ptolemy Soter had abandoned his defence of Greek freedom in 309 BC, when he found it brought him no support from the Greek cities. Ptolemy Philadelphos did more for Greek freedom than his father had done, and he was willing to supply money and ships, but not to send land forces. The interests of the king himself were placed above those of his allies, and while Philadelphos had gains as

[91] Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte*, 207 f.
[92] Hölbl, *History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, 44.
[93] Bringmann, 'The King as Benefactor', 7 f. 17 ff.; Austin, 'Kings, War and the Economy', 462 f.
[94] Bringmann, 'The King as Benefactor', 24.

well as losses from the Chremonidean War, his allies paid the penalty for its loss.

Royal euergetism was not necessarily incompatible with exploitation. Kings needed to find money, and playing the benefactor to those who could help him in their turn could result in rapacity towards others, or even to those being 'helped'.[95] War was important as a generator of income for the Hellenistic kings,[96] and the Chremonidean War does not seem to have been likely to generate extensive booty or gain new taxable territory for Ptolemy, while it was definitely a drain on his resources. It should not be surprising that Ptolemy was not wholly committed to it. Just as Ptolemy II had won plaudits for his benefaction to Telmessos by promising not to grant it in δωρεά,[97] while his son Ptolemy Euergetes performed the benefaction of giving the city to his cousin, Ptolemy son of Lysimachos (*OGIS* 55), the Athenians and Spartans were expected to be grateful for whatever favours Ptolemy chose to bestow on them. The king, not the party benefited, decided what favours he would confer, and he decided primarily in terms of his own interests.

As well as financial resources, kings needed military success, to keep the support of those who defended their kingdom and to win the support of others. This was especially the case for Alexander's successors, who lacked the family charisma of the Temenid dynasty.[98] This applied to all the kings, even the Ptolemies, who controlled Egypt, a wealthy and defensible kingdom, but who needed Greeks to keep control of it, and so needed to keep their access to the Greek homeland. It was even more important for Antigonos Gonatas, the last of Alexander's successors to establish himself securely in his kingdom after his father's failures.[99] It was not a realistic option for either Ptolemy Philadelphos or Antigonos to remain at peace with one another. If Ptolemy had not tried to weaken Antigonos' power in Greece, Antigonos would none the less have needed to increase his power to show that he was a successful fighter who deserved his royal power. Success for Antigonos in Greece would have lead him to further expansion, and the outlying possessions of the Ptolemies in the

[95] Austin, 'Kings, War and the Economy', 463.
[96] Davies, 'Hellenistic Economies in the post-Finley Era', 53.
[97] Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen II', 201 f.
[98] Austin, 'Kings, War and the Economy', 459; O'Neil, 'Creation of New Dynasties', 118–137.
[99] O'Neil, 'Creation of New Dynasties', 134.

Aegean and on the coasts of Asia Minor were a likely target, whether or not Ptolemy had done anything to provoke him. By instigating the Chremonidean War, Ptolemy Philadelphos had at least postponed the Antigonid incursion into the Aegean which led to his defeat at Kos. The hopes of victory for Ptolemy and his allies do not seem to have been as unrealistic as the surviving historical sources suggest. For Ptolemy, the Chremonidean War must have seemed a worthwhile gamble.

For his allies, Athens and Sparta, it probably seemed worthwhile too. They did not have any realistic hope of gaining complete independence from all their more powerful neighbours, the Hellenistic kings. With the support of the more distant Ptolemy, they might have been able to keep Antigonos, who was more likely to interfere in their affairs, at bay.[100] Since Antigonos' personal leadership in the war, in contrast with Ptolemy's leadership *in absentia* and his unwillingness to commit all his resources, seems to have been a major factor in the Antigonid victory, it may well have seemed a reasonable assessment for Ptolemy's Greek allies to think that he could assist them to win a victory they did not have the resources to achieve by themselves. The combined resources of Athens, Sparta and Ptolemy Philadelphos should, rationally, have been able to defeat Antigonos Gonatas; but as it turned out, the allies were unable to combine them effectively.

For the city-states had less room to manoeuvre than the kings who had much greater resources than they did. Athens and Sparta had more to lose than Ptolemy in the Chremonidean War, and they duly lost it. However, if they had not taken the chance when Ptolemy would support them, they might have had to face Antigonos by themselves at some future time. A Hellenistic king would take opportunities to expand his power when they arose, and the city-states, with their smaller resources, could survive only if they had powerful friends. Unfortunately for Athens and Sparta, Ptolemy Philadelphos does not seem to have been an effective defender of his friends.

[100] Cf. Piper, *Spartan Twilight*, 20 f.

THE UNBALANCED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PTOLEMY II AND PYRRHUS OF EPIRUS

Geoff W. Adams

1. *Introduction*

Few monarchs present such a contrast as Ptolemy II of Egypt and Pyrrhus of Epirus: Pyrrhus was a famed general, whereas Ptolemy II was an administrator. Nevertheless, they both owed their positions to Ptolemy I and ruled their respective realms in the early third century BC. The extant ancient writers ascribe no official connection between them, but this study has asked the question whether they had a φιλία alliance between 282 and 272 BC and if it changed during this period. Such a φιλία-connection was based upon an 'unofficial' friendship, which was a common occurrence between rulers during this period.

Egyptian foreign relations during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus were continually beset by the complications of conflict and shifting allegiances among the various Hellenistic rulers that sought to assert their dominance throughout the region, or sometimes simply their own survival. Throughout the first decade or so of Ptolemy Philadelphus' reign it is possible to see the continuation in the foreign policies of his father, Ptolemy I (Soter).[1] One of the most intriguing relationships that developed under Ptolemy I was his association with Pyrrhus of Epirus. This liaison had originated when Demetrius Poliorcetes sent a youthful Pyrrhus as a hostage to Egypt in the Ptolemaic court.[2] The ancient literary sources surrounding the life of Pyrrhus have often portrayed a tragic, but idealized image of the Epirot monarch,[3] but the association between him and Ptolemy I has been made quite clear.[4] However, his

[1] Seibert 1969; Huss 1994.

[2] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4.3–5.1.

[3] Justin 17.2.11; Plutarch *Demetrius* 41.3, *Pyr*rhus 3.4–5, 6.2; Duff 1999, 101–103; Mossman 1992, 90–104.

[4] Justin 16.2.2–3; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 5.1, 6.3–4; Levêque 1957, 108–109.

relationship with Ptolemy II Philadelphus is quite obscure in the literary sources.

But this does not mean that it did not exist. In his 1953 study, Giuseppe Nenci argued that there was an official relationship between both Ptolemy I and II with Pyrrhus working for their foreign and commercial interests throughout his lifetime.[5] This argument was suitably criticized shortly after its publication because of its often inconsistent and drastic use of the source material for the argument,[6] but within its rather strenuous line of reasoning there was a strong possibility that they frequently worked for their common interests. This has been generally accepted in regard to Ptolemy Soter and the assistance he provided for Pyrrhus (particularly in 298/7 BC), but the question about Pyrrhus' relationship with Ptolemy Philadelphus has remained. More recently, N.G.L. Hammond has presented a reinterpretation of Justin 17.2.14–15,[7] arguing that it was Ptolemy Philadelphus (rather than Ptolemy Keraunos) who gave Pyrrhus military assistance for Epirus in 280 BC before his ill-fated departure for Tarentum.[8] This argument seems quite compelling, but it leads to further questions of the relationship between Ptolemy II and Pyrrhus. It is the intention of this study to propose that there was originally a φιλία-connection between these two leaders, in accordance with the foreign policy theories of Gruen[9] (instead of the formal relationship argued by Nenci), but that this relationship was significantly altered (if not finished) in 278 BC with Pyrrhus' involvement in conflict with the Carthaginians in Sicily.[10] As Gruen has shown, an informal agreement of this sort was quite common during this period,[11] allowing the rulers a greater degree of freedom than in the official treaties, which would have been desirable for most leaders.

[5] Nenci 1953, 93–99.
[6] Fine 1957, 108–111.
[7] Hammond 1988, 405–413.
[8] For some of the ancient references to Pyrrhus' role in the Tarentine War, see Polybius 1.6.7–7.12; Florus, *Epitome* 1.18.1–28; Frontinus *Stratagems* 2.2.1, 2.3.21, 2.4.9, 2.4.13, 2.6.9–10, 3.6.3, 4.1.3, 4.1.14, 4.1.8, 4.4.2.
[9] Gruen 1984 vol. 1, 54–55.
[10] Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20.8.3–4; Diodorus Siculus 22.8.1–10.7; Pausanias 1.12.5–13.1.
[11] Gruen 1984 vol. 1, 54–95.

2. *Ptolemy I and Pyrrhus: the Origins of their φιλία Connection*

Before discussing the relationship between Ptolemy Philadelphus and Pyrrhus, the origin of their φιλία/*amicitia* needs to be traced back to the reign of Ptolemy Soter. The relationship between Pyrrhus and the Lagids followed from the Battle of Ipsus in 301 BC and the ensuing difficulties in Greece for Demetrius Poliorcetes,[12] who entered into a marriage alliance with Seleucus,[13] eventuating in an agreement between himself and Ptolemy I.[14] One of the parts of the agreement was Pyrrhus being sent to Egypt as a hostage, this being a common diplomatic gesture of goodwill and commitment in such a treaty.[15] The basis of Pyrrhus' relationship with Demetrius was largely due to the marriage of his sister, Deïdameia, to the Besieger,[16] as well as his own personal difficulties in Epirus, having been deposed from the throne by his second cousin Neoptolemus II.[17] The value placed on Pyrrhus by Demetrius at this time is shown by the responsibility of settling his affairs in Greece after the Battle of Ipsus, albeit unsuccessfully with the growing move against Poliorcetes in this region at the time.[18] Nevertheless, Pyrrhus was sent to Egypt as part of the deal between Demetrius and Ptolemy I,[19] which may have been partly owing to the death of Deïdameia in 300 BC,[20] and the shifting focus of Demetrius at the time.[21]

From this time the allegiances of Pyrrhus altered significantly, becoming closely aligned with the Lagids, which Plutarch attributed to his physical prowess and shrewd understanding of the internal politics of the Ptolemaic family.[22] Regardless of the motives on either side (Plutarch being the only source to directly mention the growing

---

[12] Plutarch *Demetrius* 30–31; Hammond and Walbank 1988 vol. 3, 201–203.

[13] Plutarch *Demetrius* 31.

[14] Plutarch *Demetrius* 32.

[15] Such as after the Battle of Zama between Rome and Carthage. See Polybius 15.18.8; Livy, 30.37.6; Moscovich 1974, 417–427. Sometimes the role of hostage could be advantageous, such as Philip II's time in Thebes. See also Hammond 1997, 355–372.

[16] Plutarch *Demetrius* 25.2.

[17] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4.1.

[18] Plutarch *Demetrius* 30.2–31.2.

[19] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4. See also Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 20.

[20] Plutarch *Demetrius* 32.3.

[21] This change in the focus of Demetrius was short-lived with the souring of relations between himself and Seleucus, followed by his return to Athens in 297 BC, which resulted in a failed intervention by Ptolemy I on behalf of the Athenians. See Plutarch *Demetrius* 33.1–4.

[22] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4.4–5.1.

intimacy of their relationship) the development of their relationship cannot be questioned, with the eventual marriage of Pyrrhus and Ptolemy's stepdaughter, Antigone,[23] clearly strengthening their future ties to a certain degree. Nevertheless, this should not be overstated on the part of Ptolemy I. Despite Antigone being the daughter of Berenicé, Ptolemy's apparent 'favorite',[24] it was not the most significant alliance for Ptolemy, Antigone only being his stepdaughter, but he probably saw the potential of the young Epirot and decided to make use of him. In view of the rapid change in Pyrrhus' alliances, towards both Ptolemy I and Berenicé, it is clear that he would have become a regular at the Ptolemaic court,[25] which would have drawn him into contact with the son of Berenicé and Ptolemy, the future Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Because of the lack of sources it is difficult to draw conclusions about their relationship at this time, but there can be little doubt that they would have known each other being half brothers-in-law. When Pyrrhus arrived in Egypt, Ptolemy II would have been roughly eight years old, whereas Pyrrhus was twenty-one and already quite experienced in warfare and politics. Owing to their age difference and role differences it is hard to argue that they would have developed a close relationship at this stage, but it is clear that due to their familial connections that they would not have been unknown to one another.

The φιλία between Pyrrhus and Ptolemy I resulted in Pyrrhus gaining financial and military support towards his reinstatement as king of Epirus in 297 BC.[26] Ptolemy's motivation for this was clearly based upon introducing an ally into the frame of Macedonian politics, which assisted by allowing him to focus upon more pressing areas of foreign policy: namely the question of Syria and Seleucus.[27] The motives behind this assistance included the recent death of Cassander and the uncertain conditions in Macedonia at the time, involving Agathocles in Corcyra as well.[28] After the death of Antigone, the relationship between Agathocles and Pyrrhus was confirmed, albeit temporarily, by

[23] Pausanias 1.11.5; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4.4; Errington 1990, 149.
[24] Green 1990, 119; Ogden 1999, 70; Carney, 1994, 123.
[25] Pausanias 1.11.5; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4.4–5.1; Levêque 1957, 108–109; Carney 2002, 67.
[26] Pausanias 1.6.8; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 5.1.
[27] Hammond and Walbank 1988, 205. This compliments the often defensive character of Ptolemy I's foreign policy. See also Seibert 1969, 207–224.
[28] Pausanias 1.6.8; Talbert 1997, 158.

the marriage of Lanassa with Pyrrhus.[29] Plutarch mentioned that the significance of the assistance from Ptolemy was not lost upon Pyrrhus and he maintained a high level of respect and a close relationship with him throughout the remainder of Ptolemy's life.[30] The marriage to Antigone was clearly important to Pyrrhus because it was only after her death that he began his practice of polygamy.[31] The military benefit for Ptolemy I is particularly evident in their joint involvement in the expulsion of Demetrius Poliorcetes from Macedonia in 288/7 BC.[32] In fact it seems that there was only one occasion that Pyrrhus failed to assist Ptolemy in a military conflict, when he could not assist the Ptolemaic fleet at Athens in 294 BC,[33] but this seems to have been more because of Pyrrhus' limited resources at the time.[34] This alliance would have continued into the period where both Ptolemy I and II served as co-rulers, maintaining a relationship of mutual self-interest in their foreign policies.

3. *Ptolemy II and Pyrrhus: their φιλία Connection (285–278 BC)*

The most notable aspect that must be considered when examining Ptolemy II (and his association with Pyrrhus) is his lack of military involvement. The two were diametrically opposed in many ways: Pyrrhus was the skilful general who was continually in action,[35] whereas Ptolemy Philadelphus delegated the campaigns to his generals/admirals.[36] Even Callimachus could find only one occasion when Ptolemy II led his troops.[37] Whether the reasons for this delegation were because of health problems or not is irrelevant for the present study; it is only his lack of involvement that needs to be mentioned and how he tried to further his interests within his foreign policy.

---

[29] Diodorus Siculus 22.8.2; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 9.1, 10.4–5.
[30] Plutarch., *Demetrius* 44, *Pyrrhus* 6.4.
[31] Plutarch., *Pyrrhus* 9.1; Tarn and Griffith, 1952, 55.
[32] Plutarch *Demetrius* 44.2–7; Justin, 16.2.2–3; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 11.1–6; Wheatley 2003, 197; Wheatley 1997, 19–27.
[33] Plutarch *Demetrius* 33.7.
[34] Hammond and Walbank 1988, 212–214.
[35] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 8; Austin 1986, 456.
[36] Tarn and Griffith 1952, 15; Tarn 1911, 251; Samuel 1993, 183.
[37] This is in reference to his victory over the Gauls. Callimachus *Hymn to Delos* 171–185; See also Theocritus, *Idyll* 17.98–101; Pausanias 1.7.2; Griffiths 1979, 75–76; Halperin 1983, 206–207.

Between 285–281 BC Pyrrhus continued to be involved in his struggles with Lysimachus for dominance in Macedonia.[38] At this point Ptolemy II was under increasing pressure from Seleucus,[39] which would have been his greatest concern rather than Pyrrhus' activity in Macedonia. This does not mean that their alliance had ended; it was simply just a lower priority to Ptolemy at this stage. It would seem that this was the main advantage to the formation of φιλία alliances: their informal basis allowed for a greater amount of flexibility for their participants to act according to the circumstances that affected each ruler. Pyrrhus may have been expelled from Macedonia, but his base in Epirus was secure (as long as he was present), whereas Ptolemy II was under increasing pressure on his eastern borders from Seleucid aggression. That being said, these circumstances highlight the inequality between the participants of this φιλία association, and highlight how both leaders (Ptolemy II and Pyrrhus) had their respective regions of interest to attend to.

The distance between Egypt and northern Greece prevented the ability to secure either of their interests in the others region with such competition with their rivals, but their φιλία relationship at the very least assured them of support if necessary by which they could proceed to further their own personal interests. The continuing friendship between Pyrrhus and the Ptolemaic house allowed Ptolemy II to focus upon the more pressing issues of Seleucid aggression by having Pyrrhus keep Lysimachus and particularly the Antigonids occupied in their own regions. This is explicitly shown by Plutarch in his portrayal of Demetrius' desire to make peace with Pyrrhus because of his interests elsewhere.

The informal alliance between Pyrrhus and Ptolemy II continued into 280 BC with Pyrrhus' involvement in the conflict between Rome and the southern Italian cities, particularly Tarentum.[40] This move represented a major shift in his tactics, taking him a relatively significant distance from his base in Epirus, but this was probably largely due to his lack of recent progress for advancement in Macedonia. There had been some precedent for an Epirot leader giving assistance to Tarentum in King Alexander the Molossian, who helped them around 332–

[38] Pausanias 1.10.2; Justin, 16.3.1–2; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 12.1–7; Lund 1992, 104–105.
[39] Hauben 1983, 100–101.
[40] Dionyius of Halicarnassus 19.8.1–10.5; Pausanias 1.12.1; Justin 18.1.1–11; Strabo 8.7.1.

30 BC against the Lucanians and Bruttians, which ironically led to an agreement with Rome.[41] But in this instance Pyrrhus was probably motivated by his desire to expand his influence, which was a consistent theme throughout his lifetime. But with such an expedition there was the question of his security in Epirus, which has been addressed by Hammond. He has presented a reinterpretation of Justin 17.2.14–15,[42] arguing that it was Ptolemy Philadelphus (rather than Ptolemy Keraunos) who gave Pyrrhus military assistance for Epirus in 280 BC before his departure for Tarentum. This supports the view of a φιλία relationship between the two rulers at this stage in their relationship.

Pyrrhus' move to assist Tarentum against Rome was not in any contravention of standing relations between Rome and Ptolemy Philadelphus (which were not initiated until 273), and if Pyrrhus was successful it would have added to his military influence, making him a more powerful ally of Egypt. This would have been expected considering the military successes that Pyrrhus had enjoyed previously in his career against the other Hellenistic monarchs.[43] Rome had been viewed as a developing power in Italy at this stage, but had not been directly involved in the power struggle to the east, so a victory for Pyrrhus was probably to be expected, particularly following his initial successes in the region.[44]

4. *Ptolemy II and Pyrrhus: the Possible End of their φιλία Connection (278–72 BC)*

In 278 BC Pyrrhus had begun to suffer losses at the hands of the Romans,[45] who were a more effective military force than was expected. It was at this point that Pyrrhus accepted an invitation from some of the Sicilian cities, particularly Syracuse, to liberate them.[46] But in regard to Sicily there was a complication: the Carthaginian controlled regions of Sicily.[47] According to Plutarch, the main benefit that Pyrrhus

[41] Livy 8.17.9–10; Justin 12.2.12; Strabo 6.3.4.
[42] Hammond 1988, 405–413.
[43] Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20.10.1; Justin 25.5.4–6.
[44] Dionysius of Halicarnassus 19.12.1–13.3; Diodorus Siculus 22.6.1–2; Pausanias 1.12.3; Frontinus *Stratagems* 2.4.13; Florus, 1.18.8; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 17, 21.
[45] Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20.1.1–3.7, 20.10.1–12.3; Pausanias 1.13.1–2; Frontinus *Stratagems* 2.2.1, 2.3.21; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 25–26.
[46] Pausanias 1.12.5; Diodorus Siculus 22.7.2–6; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 22–23.
[47] Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20.8.3–4; Diodorus Siculus 22.8.1–10.7; Pausanias 1.12.5–13.1; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 24; Justin, 25.3.1.

saw for annexing Sicily was its potential use as a launching point for an attack upon Libya.[48] It is important to note that Rome and Carthage worked together in their resistance to Pyrrhus,[49] it being in their mutual interests for the Epirot monarch to be expelled from Italian and Sicilian affairs. However, it was the Carthaginian φιλία relationship with Ptolemy Philadelphus that was the most damaging to Pyrrhus.

The Carthaginians and Lagids had been involved in trade since the early third century B.C.[50] It was this relationship that changed the nature of the φιλία connection between Pyrrhus and Ptolemy Philadelphus. Carthage had become one of the most influential and powerful trading centers throughout the western Mediterranean, which made them important partners of the Lagids, probably even of greater importance than Pyrrhus. The diplomatic ties with both parties meant that Ptolemy Philadelphus had to decide upon his actions carefully. In view of their comparative levels of influence it is clear that Ptolemy II was less inclined towards breaking ties with Carthage than with Pyrrhus. The Epirot King had also been the aggressor in this instance, which may have affected Ptolemy's decision.

But it was not as if Ptolemy II was directly involved: he remained neutral in the affair. This was similar to his later actions during the First Punic War,[51] when owing to his mutual alliances with Rome and Carthage; he remained neutral and offered to be an arbitrator. However, there is one important consideration to bear in mind: the passage in Justin referring to his military assistance in Epirus. In this passage Justin is quite clear that the assistance was based upon the premise that it would occur for a period of two years:

> sed Ptolemeus, cui nulla dilationis ex infirmitate virium venia esset, quinque milia peditum, equitum IV milia, elephantos L non amplius quam in biennii usum dedit. Ob haec Pyrrhus filia Ptolomei in matrimonium accepta vindicem eum regni reliquit, pacificatus cum omnibus finitimis, ne abducta in Italiam iuventute praedam hostibus regnum relinqueret.[52]

[48] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 2–3.

[49] Polybius 3.25; Appian *Sicilica* 1; Diodorus Siculus 22.7.5; Justin 18.2.1–5; Badian 1958, 34; Gruen 1984, 674; Thiel 1954, 26–28.

[50] Fraser 1972, 152–153.

[51] Appian *Sicilica* 1.

[52] Justin 17.2.14–15: 'But since Ptolemy did not have weakness in military strength as an excuse for delay, he gave 5,000 infantry, 4,000 cavalry and 50 elephants for a period of service not to exceed two years. Because of this Pyrrhus, who had accepted

As Hammond has shown it was probably Ptolemy Philadelphus who gave this assistance to Pyrrhus, which raises a significant question about the continuation of their φιλία relationship: whether the support of Ptolemy II was removed after the two years had passed, in 278 BC.

It could be argued that the troops of Ptolemy II were removed in 278 BC, owing to the new treaty undertaken by Antiochus I and Antigonus Gonatas.[53] This would have made Ptolemy's position more insecure and necessitated the consolidation of his forces. It seems that the reference by Justin to the conditions for Ptolemy's assistance had confused the eventual removal of his support with that of a prior agreement. But on the other hand, to remove these forces would weaken the position of Pyrrhus and in turn would have weakened Ptolemy II's influence in the region. Through Pyrrhus' departure for Tarentum, and in turn Sicily, Ptolemy's alliance with Pyrrhus would have seemed less attractive. The original basis for this φιλία relationship was Pyrrhus' need for assistance in gaining his Epirot throne and also the need for another Lagid ally in the continuing struggles for dominance in the region. By leaving the scene, particularly in a time of growing threats to Ptolemy II from Antiochus I, Pyrrhus had ceased to be useful in this role,[54] which may also explain the time limit placed upon support for his activity in Italy. Therefore, when this time limitation is combined with Pyrrhus' activity against the Carthaginians in Sicily in 278 BC and the new alliance between Antigonus Gonatas and Antiochus I around the same time, there is a possibility that there would have been added stress upon the relationship of Ptolemy II and Pyrrhus.

In addition to the questions raised over the continuation of the alliance between Pyrrhus and Ptolemy II by Justin 17.2.14–15, there are other indications from the ancient sources that the relationship had ended, or at least suffered. Firstly, according to Pausanias and Justin, Pyrrhus requested financial and military assistance while in Italy in 276/5 BC from Antigonus Gonatas (as King of Macedonia).[55] It is also notable that at the outset of this expedition, according to Justin, he requested military assistance from Antigonus and financial assis-

---

a daughter of Ptolemy in marriage, left him as protector of his kingdom, having made peace with all the neighbouring peoples, in order not to leave his kingdom a prey to his enemies while his own warriors had been removed to Italy.'

[53] Justin 25.1.1; Tarn 1913, 168; Heinen 1972, 189–196.

[54] Tarn 1913, 168.

[55] Pausanias 1.13.1; Justin 25.3.1–3; Mooren 1983, 207.

tance from Antiochus.[56] On this it would seem that Justin is getting the time periods confused, especially if he was receiving assistance from Ptolemy II in Epirus. Regardless of the accuracy of either reference, it is significant that Pyrrhus' most regular previous supporter, Egypt, was not present among these references after his campaign in Italy and Sicily had been completed.[57] Both Pausanias and Justin used the rejection of this appeal as a reason for Pyrrhus' attack upon Macedonia,[58] which may have been indicative of their use of Hieronymus as a source, despite Pausanias' criticisms of his bias.[59]

It is of particular interest to analyze the final two years of Pyrrhus' foreign policy where, following from his initial successes in Macedonia,[60] Pyrrhus moved into Greece against Sparta and Argos,[61] which was accommodating Antigonus Gonatas.[62] Tarn and Griffith have argued that Pyrrhus received assistance from Arsinoë II for his attack upon Macedonia in 274 BC,[63] but the available evidence does not support this. But Ptolemy II was making another substantial move in his foreign policy: an embassy was sent to Rome in 273 BC,[64] which led to a φιλία/*amicitia* relationship between the two cities.[65] Gruen has demonstrated the significance of this relationship for both states.[66] However, for the present study it is significant because it represents a shift in the policies of Ptolemy II, which may provide a further indication of the degeneration in the perceived value of the φιλία relationship with Pyrrhus. Judging from the neutral stance taken by Ptolemy II during the First Punic War,[67] it is clear that the φιλία relationships with both Carthage and Rome were of some importance to him, having greater potential benefits than a friendly alliance with a smaller nation like Epirus.

---

[56] Justin 17.2.13; Hammond and Walbank 1988, 246.
[57] Pausanias 1.13.2. See Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 26.
[58] Pausanias 1.13.2; Justin 25.3.2.
[59] Pausanias 1.9.8; Habicht 1998.
[60] Pausanias 1.13.2–3; Justin 25.3.5–8; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 26.
[61] Pausanias 1.13.4–6, 3.6.3, 4.29.6; Strabo 8.6.18; Justin 25.4.6–5.2; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 27–34; Gabbert 1997, 41; Schaps 1982, 194.
[62] Pausanias 1.13.7–8; Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 31–34.
[63] Tarn and Griffith 1952, 17.
[64] Dio, fr. 41 = Zonaras 8.6.11; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20.14.1–2; Valerius Maximus 4.3.9; Justin 18.2.9; Neatby 1950, 89–98.
[65] Appian *Sicilica* 1; Eutropius 2.15; Dio fr. 41 = Zonaras 8.6.11; Livy *Periocha* 14; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20.14.12.
[66] Gruen 1984, 673–674.
[67] Appian *Sicilica* 1.

5. *The Events after the Death of Pyrrhus (272–260 BC)*

The events and foreign policy of Ptolemy II following from the death of Pyrrhus can provide a similar degree of insight into the effect that this had upon Ptolemy II's foreign policy. Up until 272/1 BC, the main focus of Ptolemy Philadelphus' foreign policy had been upon the Seleucids. However, at this time there was a major shift in focus, which seems to have been primarily towards Greece and the western Mediterranean. It seems as if the first step taken by Ptolemy II was to secure a peace settlement with Antiochus I in 271 BC, following from the First Syrian War. Around this time Ptolemy II seems to be more focused upon moving against Antigonus Gonatas, which may have been due to the influence of his wife and sister Arsinoë II,[68] although this is unlikely,[69] with the aspirations of Gonatas being another,[70] him having recently taken *de facto* control of Macedonia.[71] In 268 BC, Arsinoë II died and according to the Decree of Chremonides,[72] Ptolemy II continued the policy of his ancestors and sister/queen by assisting Athens in the Chremonidaean War from 266–61 BC.[73] This conflict saw a renewal in joint Egyptian and Epirot actions against the Antigonids, through the involvement of Pyrrhus' son, Alexander II.[74]

For the present study, the most significant feature is the dramatic shift in Lagid foreign policy, with a temporary peace being declared between Egypt and Antiochus I, while Ptolemy's focus seems to have been almost entirely upon removing Antigonus Gonatas. Up until this point in his reign, direct conflict between them had been minimal,[75] which may have been assisted by Pyrrhus' involvement, thus making the Ptolemaic contribution against the Antigonids more indirect.

---

[68] See also Foertmeyer 1988, 90.
[69] Macurdy 1932, 119; Burnstein 1982, 197–212.
[70] Buraselis 1982.
[71] Chambers 1954, 392.
[72] *Syll.*[3] vol. 1, 434/5; Grzybek 1990, 103–112.
[73] Michel 1976, 130; See also Pausanias 1.1.1; Robertson 1982, 1–44; Ferguson 1910, 189; Erskine 1995,44 and James O'Neil's contribution in this volume.
[74] Justin 26.2.1–9.
[75] Hauben 1983, 100.

6. *Conclusions*

It would seem that following from the period in which Pyrrhus went to Egypt as a hostage in 299/8 BC until his unsuccessful Sicilian campaigns from 278–6 BC, there was a clear trend of supporting mutual interests between both Ptolemy I and II with the Epirot king. This relationship seems to have been based primarily upon an informal φιλία relationship. This allowed greater freedom for both parties to pursue their particular interests, while only requiring action (be it fiscal or military) if necessary. However, it did also require both parties to respect the interests of the other. This is why it seems that Pyrrhus' Sicilian campaign against Carthaginian interests was so pivotal: Ptolemy II and Carthage also had a φιλία relationship. By exerting so much effort in Italy and Sicily, Pyrrhus had also ceased to perform the role that was in Ptolemaic interests from the outset: to help curtail the growth of Antigonid power.

The conflict of interests for Ptolemy arising from the events in Sicily, in conjunction with other developments, such as the alliance of Antigonus Gonatas and Antiochus I, saw a significant decline in his relationship with Pyrrhus. This was most notably expressed in Pyrrhus' appeal to the other Hellenistic monarchs for assistance before his return to Epirus in 275/4 BC. However, owing to their mutual interests, particularly those against Antigonus Gonatas, the results from the end of their φιλία relationship were not evident until after Pyrrhus' death in 272 BC. It was at this point that with the loss of Pyrrhus' presence in the region Ptolemy II needed to reassess his foreign policy,[76] resulting in peace with Antiochus I at the conclusion of the First Syrian War and the resumption of hostilities with the Antigonids.

[76] Cf. Tarn at Adcock et al (eds.) *CAH* vol. 7 (1928), 705.

OGIS 1 266: KINGS AND CONTRACTS IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD

Matthew Trundle

In his fourteenth *Idyll*, Theokritos (14.58–59; see Lewis 1986, 10–11) praised Ptolemy II Philadelphos of Egypt as the best paymaster (*misthodotes… aristos*) for a free man (*eleutheros*), in the words of a friend advising a lovesick companion seeking a life elsewhere. No doubt this was a subtle advertisement to all those seeking the patronage of a great man and who could choose their patron. Such statements were not new. Xenophon heard his friend Proxenos praising Kyros in exactly the same terms over a century earlier (Xenophon *Anabasis* 3.1.4), and all who served Alexander saw him as the greatest of gift-givers. The Hellenistic world of monarchs and mercenaries was a new age in which reciprocal conditions of service and relationships flowed between kings and mercenaries. Mercenaries travelled the world and would-be employers needed ways in which to promote themselves to these potential allies and bind them to their service.

Many scholars see the end of the classical period and the birth of the Hellenistic age sometime during the fourth century BCE, perhaps with the ascent of Philip and the Macedonians (Fine 1983; Davies 1989; Griffith 1935), or the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BCE (Rhodes 2006), or even in 301 BCE with the battle of Ipsos (Parke 1933). These are arbitrary acts of historical convenience. In a recent study of Greek mercenaries several reasons justified its termination with the Lamian war in 322 BCE (Trundle 2004, 8–9; but see also Hammond 1959, 651). Firstly, this war was a turning point in Greek history, and particularly in Athenian history, as no longer could Greek communities claim an independent foreign policy (*pace* Green 1990, 11; Cary 1935, 6–9). This of course is not strictly true, as many Greek states such as Rhodes and the communities of the Aetolian League continued to have militias and to wage wars through the third century BCE (Ma 2000, 337–376). Secondly, the size of the Hellenistic kingdoms dwarfed the *poleis*, and as a consequence the focus of Greek history moves from the small *poleis* to amorphous monarchies incorporating large and diverse territories and peoples (see for example Braund 2003, 21). Thirdly, the

nature of all military relationships changed from those dominated by the civic community to that of the powerful individual and his network of friends and associates (for example Billows 1990, 250; McKechnie 1989, chapter 8; Savalli-Lestrade 1998).

National or cultural ties still played some role in determining relationships after 322 BCE, but better rewards could be found with the great providers amongst the Hellenistic monarchies. Ties to cities played less of a role in motivating individuals to fight, though for many men like Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes this was not necessarily true in the fourth century, and arguably it was not true for Xenophon in the fifth century BCE. In addition, military settlements (*apoikiai*, *klerouchoi* and *katoikiai*) and garrisons (*phrouroi*) created special circumstances in military service on a much more uniform and stable footing (Cohen 1978, 45–60; Chaniotis 2005, 84–93), though even these garrisons had their forerunners in the later fifth and fourth centuries BCE in western Asia (Tuplin 1987, 167–245). Egypt, about which we have the most information, provides a detailed picture of the allotment of land (*kleroi*) to military settlers (Lewis 1986, 24–27) in order to create a permanent and hereditary military class upon which the pharaoh could rely (Lewis 1986, 21).

Finally, and perhaps most justifiably, the sources for the history of events after the end of the Lamian war make it practically impossible to distinguish between mercenary, citizen and professional soldiers. This is particularly true during the period of the *diadochoi* wars as the fluid nature of allegiances and the sketchy evidence make it difficult to ascertain a distinction between mercenaries and professionals. These wars allowed for the proliferation of professional soldiering on a much larger scale when compared to earlier periods (Parke 1933, 206–211). As a consequence, being a mercenary had become the norm and all soldiers appear as professionals. The terminology in our sources was transformed, a point not lost on H.W. Parke (1933, 208–209) when justifying the terminus of his book on Greek mercenaries:

> Instead of simplifying our task, this prevalence of the mercenary makes it the more difficult. For when once all soldiers have been reduced to one professional type, our authorities cease often to distinguish the mercenary as such. All fighting men are *stratiotai* and *pezoi* or *hippeis*.

Griffith, who began his *Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* with the reign of Alexander the Great, had similar reasons to see a division between Classical and Hellenistic history. As he stated, 'the professional soldiers

of the ancient world were mercenaries' (Griffith 1935, 1). Things are, of course, more complicated in reality. The blur between the periods has long been recognised as most scholars noted above would agree. But, in reference to mercenary activity it is clear that mercenary relationships existed in similar fashions throughout the latter part of the *polis* period and continued into the Hellenistic Age.

It is a fact that Hellenistic rulers saw mercenaries as integral to the stability of their regimes. Furthermore, the rulers of Egypt, Asia and Pergamon looked to (imported and settled) Greek and Macedonian soldiers for their military strength and security. The Ptolemies, Attalids and Seleukids, each dynasty ruling over a newly conquered territory, needed Greeks to provide themselves with military support. This support required reciprocity and was in no way given freely. The point is well illustrated by the analysis of a specific document. The inscription *OGIS* 1.266 outlines the relationship between Eumenes I and his soldiers from the garrisons at Philetereia-under-Ida and Attaleia, and it is unique. Its clauses have been published, translated and well discussed (Austin 1981, 320 no. 196; Bagnall and Derow 2004, 46 no. 23; Chaniotis 2005, 86–88; Bengtson 1975, no. 481; Griffith 1935; for discussion see Launey 1987, 738–746; Schalles 1985, 32; Virgilio 1983, 97–140). The document dates to the reign of Eumenes, 263–241 BCE, the ruler, but not yet king, of Pergamon. Eumenes' successor Attalos I (reigned 241–197 BCE) was the first Attalid monarch to take up the mantle of *basileus* (king). He took the title after defeating the Gauls in Mysia (Polybius 18.41:7–8; Shipley 2000, 312). It remains the first and only document of its kind, though we can identify many parallels for the ideas it embodies in other inscriptions, notably the treaty between Eupolemos of Karia and Theangela of 310 BCE in which mercenaries (*stratiotai*) are mentioned, are to receive (notably) four months' pay (*opson*)—many of them went on to become military settlers under the king (Chaniotis 2005, 84; Austin 1981, no. 33). Other treaties also tell us of similar relationships like that of Rhodes and Hierapytna (Austin 1981, no. 95), in which the Rhodians agreed to pay specified wages to the Cretans in their service (Chaniotis 2005, 83).

Eumenes ruled from 263–241 BCE. The date of the inscription *OGIS* 1.266 is not concrete even though the document dates itself internally. In relation to the forty-fourth year taxes are mentioned. But what is meant by the forty-fourth year? Various arguments are well discussed by Launey (1987, 744). Many years ago Reinach thought forty-four years related to the death of Alexander putting the agreement on taxa-

tion, at least, to 280/279 BCE. This is not likely. Suggestions include the years of service a veteran might have provided, which still provides no foothold for the date of the inscription. Life expectancy makes this solution unlikely, but not out of the question, given that elite units like the veteran Silver Shields (*argyraspides*) of the Successor wars were supposedly men in their sixties and still on active duty in 317/6 BCE (Diodorus 19.41.2). Other solutions may concern the Seleukid dynasty's reign in Asia. The later Attalids followed the Seleukid Regnal dating system. This would place the inscription in either 267 BCE or perhaps 262/1 BCE. The Seleukids saw the restoration of Babylonia to Seleukos Nikator in 312/311 BCE as the start of their era (Shipley 2000, 286; see Diodorus 19.90). At some point after 281 BCE, Pergamon ceased minting coinage with the heads of the Seleukid monarchs, but continued to use the Seleukid dating system (Hansen 1971, 16–21). Alternatively, the inscription may date to 262/1, after the defeat of Antiochos I and just after the accession of Eumenes to the Attalid throne. Thus, forty-four years refers back to the acclamation of Seleukos Nikator, along with several other *diadochoi*, as king (*basileus*) and successor to Alexander.

Any interpretation rests upon the translation of the document. Griffith translates the specific clause 'that there will be freedom from taxes from the forty-fourth year', which implies no necessary relationship to an absolute fixed date (and suggests either a specific or universal application to soldier, army, or dynasty). Austin (1981, 320–321), on the other hand, translates the key passage as follows: 'concerning the taxes: / the freedom from taxation (granted) in the forty-fourth year shall apply.' Consequently, the mercenaries were demanding concessions like those implemented earlier in 269/8 BCE and as Launey (1987, 745) thought the inscription reaffirmed concessions previously granted in the forty-fourth year presumably under Eumenes' predecessor Philetairos. Finally, for an extreme later date, Hansen (1971, 23) suggests a date around the Second Syrian war, c. 253 BCE at the very latest. To him Eumenes had taken advantage of Antiochos II's campaigns to extend his empire in other directions resulting in domestic troubles for himself.

An early date in the reign of Eumenes is the most likely. New monarchs would need to establish their own authority quickly. The Hellenistic era is littered with examples of new monarchs being forced to establish themselves at home and abroad before gaining credibility. Good examples span Hellenistic history from Antiochos III (reigned 223–187 BCE) who faced rebellion in nearly all quarters of the Seleukid

kingdom when he ascended the throne (Bar-Kochva 1976, 119), to the conflict between Aristonikos and Attalos III (Ogden 1999, 207–208). Eumenes, a new monarch in a precarious situation, defeated the invading Antiochos, but his mercenaries believed that their rewards were slight and therefore revolted. Thus the inscription then relates to a little while after 269/8 BCE, around 263/2 BCE, the forty-fourth year of the Seleukid dating system and the start of Eumenes' reign.

Arguably, the document is the most important extant evidence from the Hellenistic period outlining the obligations of both soldiers and their employer to each other (Griffith 1935, 172–173 and 276–294). Most commentators believe the inscription is most likely a testament to the conclusion of a dispute between Eumenes and his men (Launey 1987, 739). One commentator (Gonzales 1998) alone argued that it simply affirmed a relationship and promoted Euemenes as a good employer for prospective soldiers, though most recently Angelos Chaniotis (2005, 88) suggested the document reflected the opposite: Eumenes was, in reality, a bad employer. It is likely that the mercenaries under Eumenes' service had revolted for approximately four months, the period referred to in the inscription (Griffith 1935, 285; Bagnall and Derow 2004, 46). For a dispute to last that long there must have been serious issues to resolve, and strong feelings on both sides. Even this is not certain and has been challenged. Chaniotis (2005, 88) reckons that "The mercenaries perhaps wanted to make sure that they received agreed pay for the *coming* four months, and that this pay would not be set off against other sums owed to them by Eumenes." He suggests, attractively, that four months was the time period in which wages were agreed and payable and he cites other evidence to support this, like the commander of a garrison Kyrbissos, who served for four months (*SEG* XXVI.1306). We can add that four months also appears in the payment dispute on the *Anabasis* of Kyros the Younger. The men received four months' pay (*misthos*) to settle disquiet in the army when only three was owed (Xenophon *Anabasis* 1.2.11–12). Whether concluding a long dispute or confirming an existing relationship, the inscription represents a written contract between Eumenes and his professional soldiers.

Other details give context to the inscription. Several key sanctuary locations in the eastern Mediterranean showcased the inscription. These included the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon, Gryneion (probably in the sanctuary of Apollo), Delos (also Apollo), and the sanctuary of Asklepios at Mytilene. The gods always witnessed agreements and alliances in antiquity (van Wees 2004, 10–15 for several examples of

such military alliances). It was natural for contractual inscriptions of this nature to have been placed at sacred locations. In addition they were well-visited sites. As for these sites, Pergamon is an obvious site as the centre of the Attalid kingdom (Green 1990, 166). Delos was a panhellenic sanctuary, important to both the Ionian islanders and mainland Greeks (Green 1990, 590). Gryneion was a port town located only 30 km from Pergamon. Here was a seaward centre of commercial and military traffic to and from Eumenes' powerbase. Mytilene was an important and nearby coastal town on the large island of Lesbos west of Pergamon. Thus, both Gryneion and Mytilene were strategic centres of Pergamene interest due to their geographical positioning in the eastern Aegean.

These four centres may have had other tangible significance in mercenary recruitment for the Attalids. As stated above, sanctuaries were well-visited places. They spread news and information. The sanctuaries where Eumenes placed these inscriptions may well be significant for their associations. Inscriptions like this one boasted to the world that Eumenes was an upright and decent employer. Gryneion (Grynea, Grynium) was one of the twelve Aeolian cities known to Herodotus (1.149.1). The Apollo worshipped there thence derived the surname of Gryneus (Virgil *Eclogue* 6.72; *Aeneid* 4.345). Gryneion lay only thirty kilometres south of Pergamon. Parmenion captured it in 335 BCE from the Persians and enslaved the population. In Roman times Gryneion was known for the temple and oracle of Apollo (Strabo 6.22). Pausanias (1.21.7) describes the grove of Apollo that was linked to the temple and oracle. Unfortunately, little is known about the oracle of Gryneian Apollo. In classical times, Apollo may have had mercenary connections that went back to the fifth century BCE. The Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassae might have been to Apollo the Mercenary and not only to Apollo the Healer (Cooper 1978, 20–28; 1996, 75–79; Fields 1994, 95–113; Trundle 2004, 53). Apollo the Mercenary therefore could well have been another aspect of Apollo the god. Importantly, Apollo and Asklepios both have mutual associations, oracular and healing powers. Athena is well known for her military prowess. All these gods were ideal for advertising to the world the integrity of Eumenes as the ruler of an emerging power.

The inscription itself is divided into three sections: the clauses stating the agreement (below) followed by the oaths sworn respectively by the soldiers and Eumenes. The seven clauses that detail the resolution of the dispute read as follows (translations *pace* Griffith):

[σ]ίτου τιμὴν ἀποτίνειν τοῦ μεδίμνου δραχμὰς τέσσ[α|ρ]ας, οἴνου τοῦ μετρητοῦ δραχμὰς τέσσαρας

(1) To pay as the cash value of the grain (allowance) four drachmas for twelve gallons, and of the wine (allowance) four drachmas for nine gallons

ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὅπως ἄγηται δεκάμηνος, ἐμβόλιμον δὲ οὐκ ἄξει

(2) Concerning the year: that it be reckoned as having ten months, and he will not reckon an intercalary (month)

ὑπὲρ τῶν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀποδόντων τὸν κύριον καὶ γενομένων ἀπέργων, ὅπως ὀψώνιον λαμβάνωσι τοῦ προειργασμένου χρόνου

(3) Concerning those who have given the full number (of campaigns) and who are no longer in service: That they receive the pay for the time they have previously served

ὑπὲρ ὀρφανικῶν, ὅπως ἂν οἱ ἄγχιστα γένους λαμβάνωσιν, ἢ ὧι ἂν ἀπολίπηι

(4) Concerning orphans: that the next of kin take them over, or the one left behind (the heir)

ὑπὲρ τελῶν, ὅπως ἂν ἡ ἀτέλεια ὑπάρχηι ἡ ἐν τῶι τετάρτωι καὶ τεσσαρακοστῶι ἔτει. ἐάν τις ἄπεργος γένηται ἢ παραιτή[σ]ηται ἀφιέ[σ|θ]ω καὶ ἀτελὴς ἔστω ἐξάγων τὰ αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχοντα

(5) Concerning taxation: that there will be freedom from taxes in the forty-fourth year. If anyone goes out of service or asks to be dismissed, let him be released, removing his own belongings free of impost

ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀψωνίου οὗ ὡμολόγησεν τῆς τετραμήνου, ἵνα δοθῆι [τὸ ὁμ]όλογον, καὶ μὴ ὑπολογιζέσθω εἰς τὸ ὀψώνιον

(6) Concerning the pay which was agreed for the four months: that the agreed amount be given, and let it not be reckoned as part of the pay

ὑπὲρ τῶν λευ[κί]νων ὅπως καὶ τὸν σῖτον λάβωσιν τοῦ χρόνου οὗ καὶ τὸν στέφανον

(7) Concerning the 'Poplar Brigade': that they receive the grain for the period for which (they were granted) also (maintain) the garland.

The document details the relationship between paymaster (*misthodotês*) —employer—king and commanders and then their men. The Hellenistic world, like the world before the rise of the Greek *poleis*, was one in which individuals dominated social and political activity, rather than communities. Kings and autocrats determined social, economic and political advantage (for examples see Grant 1982, 21–105; McKechnie 1989, chapter 8). But personal influence of this nature was never absent from the Greek world. The Persian kings, Egyptian pharaohs

and the tyrants of the Sicilian cities had long been a source of lucrative gain and employment for ambitious Greeks. Whether it was Memnon of Rhodes, who briefly led the Persian resistance to Alexander the Great and became second in command to the Great King of Persia himself (Diodorus 17.7.2, 29.1) or Xenophon the historian to whom the network he established through Proxenos to Kyros was worth so much, foreign friendship networks promoted international relationships and military alliances. A friend of Xenophon, Proxenos the Boeotian, had persuaded Xenophon to go on the *Anabasis* saying that Kyros was worth more to him than his native state, one hundred years prior to the Battle of Ipsos (Xenophon *Anabasis* 3.1.4). Examples of this kind of extra-polis relationship proliferate in the later polis period. *Xenia* and *philia* played primary roles in binding individuals together well before the Hellenistic era (Herman 1987, 97–105; Mitchell 1997, 111–147; Pritchett vol. 2, 59–116; Trundle 2004, 147–164). Furthermore, additional parallels could be made to the *Iliad* as the chieftains followed Agamemnon as *xenoi* in search of booty and reward other than money.

The uniqueness of the contract is in its form, but not in its content. It is the first known example to spell out the obligations and privileges of men and employer in a written document. Contracts, if we can call them such, between mercenaries and paymasters were not new. There are as we shall see certain things that are identifiably new to Hellenistic relationships and these are specifically related to new circumstances that are military, political, social and economic in the Hellenistic world. The establishment of alliances and friendships under oath rather than through traditional ritualised friendships was common well before Alexander crossed to Asia (*Iliad* 3.73, 94, 256, 323; Thucydides 5.47; Isocrates 14.33). Military alliances between states were always solemnised by oaths and often treaties were inscribed on stone (Bauslaugh 1991, 56–64; Meiggs and Lewis 1969, no. 10; Tod 1948, nos. 126, 127, 144; van Wees 2004, 10–15). Mercenaries affirmed their relationships and loyalty to employers with oaths and rituals. Furthermore, gifts in the form of symbols or money tied men together from the inception of campaigns and solidified their relationships as they proceeded upon them (Trundle 2004, 114). Thus, Xenophon and the Thracian Seuthes upon the return of the Ten Thousand from the east at the start of the fourth century BCE formalised their relationship through gift-exchange (Xenophon *Anabasis* 7.3.20), Dion and his mercenaries at Syracuse exchanged gifts and crowns (Plutarch *Dion* 31) and

Agesilaos gave and received symbols of friendship from his Egyptian allies (Plutarch *Agesilaus* 31).

On the surface it would appear that the inscription represents a new development in affirming relationships. Previously, contracts of this nature were made either through treaties of alliance between states or verbal agreements. The written expression of obligation therefore provides a new departure. But evidence, particularly from Athenian naval contexts, suggests that agreements between employer and men existed in the late fifth century. Athenian trireme commanders (*trierarchoi*) probably kept lists even of their oarsmen (Demosthenes 50.10; Strauss 2000, 272), while mercenary commanders literally signed on (*apographô*) men in much the same way as jurors were signed on for Athenian courts. Diodorus (16.30.2) noted that the Phocians at Delphi signed mercenaries into their service in the mid-fourth century BCE. Of course, such terminology in our sources may only reflect specific turns of phrase; Livy's (e.g. 6.6.14) early Romans supposedly signed on (*scribere*) to the civilian legions, but, in a complex system of provision and pay, lists may well have been necessary to keep track of relationships. *OGIS* 1.266 is therefore part of a continuum of inter-relationships that goes back to the classical period regarding trends of verbal agreements about relationships betweengreat men and troops. The nature and form of these agreements culminates with this inscription.

Moving to specific observations about this inscription, we can identify other themes of military service that have precedents well before the mid-third century BCE. The first is the subject of clauses one, three, and (tangentially) seven. Remuneration was the most important and defining feature of mercenary and thus professional military service (Parke 1933, 1; Griffith 1935, 1; Trundle 2004, 21–24). And unsurprisingly remuneration is a dominant theme of the inscription. Money had long played a significant role in Greek warfare. *OGIS* 1.266 recognises the role of money specifically in two clauses, three and six. Clause three looks at the financial rewards for two types of veterans, those whose contract has expired and those no longer in service, possibly because of age. The second part of clause three "that they receive pay for the time they have previously served" is vague. Does this mean that they were not previously paid, and therefore revolted? Did they demand extra compensation on top of their earlier payment? Additionally, this payment could be a pension or bonus for serving. We have discussed above some of the problems of the four months in clause six, but it is not out of the question that four months was a standardised time period

of payment for service. Griffith (1935, 284) sensibly translates *apergia* as 'idle' rather than referring to an invalid or retired soldier. Settled troops required a guarantee of income in the absence of warfare.

Wages were crucial, to ensure the loyalty of the troops. This was commonly called *misthos* in the Classical period (Griffith 1935, 264–273; Pritchett 1971, 1–27; Loomis 1998, 33–35; Trundle 2004, 84–87), but by the third century was known as *opson* (Griffith 1935, 274–280). The latter is an euphemistic term from the sauce that garnished and flavoured one's bread, or perhaps in our terms 'iced one's cake' (see Davidson 1999, 21–25, 31–32). Bonuses for good service, covered in the agreement of Eumenes and his men also had precedents in an earlier age. Kyros promised a bonus of five minae to the Ten Thousand in 401 (Xenophon *Anabasis* 1.4.13), and Jason of Pherae paid bonuses to his best men who loved toil (*philoponos*) and danger (*philokindynos*) in the 370s BCE (Xenophon *Hellenica* 6.1.6). Alexander rewarded men who had status and quality with double pay (Arrian *Anabasis* 6.10.1). Elite units, like that recognised in the inscription as the 'White [or Poplar] Brigade' also had their origins in the *polis* armies of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. The Spartan three hundred knights (*hippeis*), Arkadian chosen men (*epilektoi*), Argive picked men (*logades*), and the Theban Sacred Band (*hieros lochos*) all predate the Hellenistic age. Alexander's attack force (*agêma*), shield-bearers (*hypaspistai*), and the Silver Shields (*arguraspides*) of the Diadochic wars all followed older traditions that were continued amongst the kings of the Hellenistic Age.

Remuneration for military service had always come in a variety of forms throughout the earlier *polis* period, but particularly as consumables and money for food without which no army can survive. The first clause demonstrates rations' importance, but also the dependence that the men had on their employer for their provision. Clearly Eumenes agreed to pay money for food (*sitêresion* in an earlier age: see Demosthenes 4.28, 50.10–12; Xenophon *Anabasis* 6.2.4). In the Hellenistic era this was typically called *sitarchia* (Griffith 1935, 267–268). The contract calls for the allocation of two staples, grain and wine. Here it seems that the employer agrees to make available and even regulate the provision and price of grain and wine. In a world of settler-garrison soldiers, in which plundering of immediate territories was not an option, the men relied heavily on their employer for sustenance. In earlier periods, generals who prohibited plundering made markets (*agorai*) available, as Kyros had to do for his army as it moved through friendly lands in 401 BCE (Xenophon *Anabasis* 1.5.5–6; see van Wees 2004, 104–108). Set-

tler soldiers needed land or resources to feed themselves and their families. Clause one deals with this central issue immediately. Launey (1987, 739–741) discusses the arguments about the meaning of this clause and goes so far as to compare contemporary prices for grain and wine in the mid-third century BCE. He concludes that the prices for grain and wine listed were favourable to the soldiers. Clause seven highlights rations further. Here the elite unit called the 'Poplar Brigade' gains its status. This fuels more questions: did the elite unit gain more or better-quality food than the other mercenary units, and what was the time period for which they were granted grain? The garland or crown (*stephanos*) may refer not to an emblem of status (though these were commonly awarded for valour in Hellenistic times: Chaniotis 2005, 38), but perhaps to a bonus payment associated with the honour in addition to other rewards (Austin 1981, 322 n. 8). Provisioning men in settled-garrison communities was more common to the Hellenistic era than earlier times, but it had parallels with earlier Greek history.

The care of orphans was also a hangover from earlier Greek practices. Along with the other agreements this represents a developing relationship between employer and soldier and a growing level of reciprocal responsibility and dependence between the two. Alexander's relationships with his troops in the East, particularly those left as garrison troops there, must have set standards for Hellenistic practices (though these too may have precedents with the many garrisons in the western Persian Empire of the Classical Period, see, for examples, Tuplin 1987, 167–245). Such practices also have their origins in civic responsibilities found in the classical era like awarding funerals to dead servicemen and state provision for the upbringing of orphaned children, both of which are found in earlier Athenian custom. These two privileges show a basic understanding of a social contract between the employer (whether state or individual) and the soldier. The importance of professional soldiers as settlers loyal to the ruler is undeniable. Professional soldiers, dislocated from their civic communities, still saw in their funeral rites significant honour. Jason of Pherae promised such to his mercenaries in the 370s BCE (Xenophon *Hellenica* 6.1.6). Additionally, that his children will receive care and protection if he dies, whether by a next of kin or whom the soldier wills them to was also important to a soldier (Austin 1981, 320; see Stroud 1971, 287–288). Chaniotis (2005, 87) notes the possibility that the clause in *OGIS* 1.266 may relate to the property of the orphans and cites Aristotle's (*Politics* 1.1268 a 14) use of the term *orphanika* 'orphans' things', but also posits that this clause may refer to

the specific nomination of the guardian over the property of the dead man's children (87–88; see *SEG* XXVII.806 and below). Austin (1981, 322 n. 5) and Launey (1987, 744) speculate that this provision may relate to future recruitment opportunities. We may note that Alexander had made similar provision for the sons of his soldiers in Persia (Plutarch *Alexander* 71). Several precedents for the care of families can be found. Kyros had the care of the families of his garrison troops who accompanied him on the *Anabasis* at Tralles (Xenophon *Anabasis* 1.4.8). Chaniotis (2005, 86) noticed that Euphron, a Sikyonian ally of the Athenians, obliged the generals to put his orphans under their care with special privileges in 323–318 BCE, and cites *SEG* XXVII.806 to show the importance of the administration of property until the orphans came of age. Most significantly, and this may well go to the heart of the matter in the inscription, Alexander ensured that orphaned boys of men killed in his service continue to receive their father's pay (Plutarch *Alexander* 71). By the Hellenistic age, care of families must have been a key part of an employer's responsibilities. Ptolemy Soter protected soldiers' families in Egypt and other examples of such Hellenistic custom are well documented (see Chaniotis 2005, 85–88; Pomeroy 1984, 100–103).

Finally, and of most interest in the Hellenistic context, are clauses two and five concerning the campaigning season and taxation. Both are products of new relationships and a new age. Firstly, the limiting of a campaigning season to ten instead of twelve months is new. There does not appear to be anything in earlier evidence that relates back to such an agreement. Not that year-round warfare was new to the Hellenistic age, especially for protracted sieges. Clearly an objection to the intercalation of additional months of service was connected to exploitation. The men saw no advantage in campaigning for extra months with no remuneration (Launey 1987, 741–742). In addition, the tax relief proposed in clause five has further implications for the relationship binding men to employer. Ptolemaic Egypt witnessed the use of taxation to tie men to the dynasty as, for example, military settlers gained tax relief from the monarch: they paid the *apomoira* tax at ten percent rather than the almost seventeen percent paid by other landholders (Fraser 1972, 166; Lewis 1986, 24–25; see Manning 2003, 49–50, 140–146). The rise of the need for reliable and loyal servicemen and the mobility of professional soldiers changed the relationship between men and employer.

These two clauses are genuine illustrations of what has been called 'interactive kingship' in the Hellenistic Age (Chaniotis 2005, 69). Ordi-

nary men were empowered in the marketplace of war. The importance of Greeks and Macedonians in the post-Alexander world meant employers like Ptolemy and Eumenes needed to keep mercenaries loyal and in their service. The Hellenistic era is littered with examples of desertion of men and the subsequent death of the leader. Perdikkas and Eumenes, both provide examples of this (Griffith 1933, 262). Clearly there was competition between the *diadochoi* for mercenaries, as there was for almost everything from library books to elephants. The fluid nature of new allegiances—combined with the supposed superiority of Greek and Macedonian soldiers over their non-Greek counterparts—meant that if mercenaries surrendered, as they did at Gabiene, Gaza or Ipsos, then they could simply be absorbed into the army of the victorious general (Griffith 1935, 262). Alexander had done the same thing for those Greeks who remained with Dareios to the very end of his life in 330 BCE (Arrian *Anabasis* 3.21; Diodorus 17.27).

No wonder in his fourteenth *Idyll* Theokritos puts words of advice into the mouth of a friend of a lovesick man to the effect that Ptolemy Philadelphos is the best employer for a man who has options. These words must have resonated in the ears of his competitors, the other Hellenistic monarchs. Tax relief and other fiscal benefits within the territory of a monarch kept men loyal and in service to the great man all year round and for the rest of their lives. *OGIS* 1.266 merely illustrates the point. Eumenes may have been a bad employer, and he may have had trouble with his men, but the document specifically illustrates the conditions of a new age. Men empowered by circumstance would honour and follow their leaders, but not without conditions. These relationships were a long way from Homeric chieftains leading retainers blindly into war. Professional soldiers participated fully in a reciprocated relationship. The ruler had responsibilities, some traditional, some new, but the men of the early Hellenistic world had power in themselves. Alongside new terminology for pay and soldiering, the professional, permanent and military employee guarding the interests of the Great Man was a new feature of the ancient Greek world, and one that had clearly grown from a series of relationships that stretched back into the Greek past. Documents like *OGIS* 1.266 inform us clearly about the new conditions of service and new relationships that had emerged in the wake of Alexander's conquests and the competition of his successors for support and power.

SECTION GAMMA

COUNTLESS ARE THE LANDS … BUT NO LAND BRINGS FORTH SO MUCH AS LOW-LYING EGYPT

EGYPTIANS IN THE HELLENISTIC WOODPILE: WERE HEKATAIOS OF ABDERA AND DIODOROS SIKELIOTES RIGHT TO SEE EGYPT IN THE ORIGINS OF GREECE?

Martin Bernal

The reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos has been rightly seen as a period of consolidation of Hellenic rule of Egypt. The capital was definitively shifted from ancient Memphis to new Alexandria. This signified increased contact with Mediterranean and Aegean worlds. However, the conventional academic view that Hellenistic Alexandria was hermetically sealed off from Egypt, as typified by the claim that a Latin term for the situation of the city was *ad Aegyptum*, takes it too far. No Greek version of the Roman term was has been attested from the Ptolemaic period. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that under Philadelphos the employment of Egyptians in the administration encouraged by Alexander and tolerated by Ptolemy Soter ended, and the use of Demotic as an official language substantially decreased. From now on, higher administrators were required to be Greek or hellenized Egyptians or other 'barbarians'.[1]

These political changes were paralleled culturally with an extraordinary development of Greek, language, literature and scholarship. The greatest Hellenistic poets and scholars, Kallimakhos, Theokritos and Apollonios of Rhodes, all flourished under Philadelphos. These authors tended to base their works on Homer, Hesiod and Pindar, and use Greek myth and topography in their poems. The political and cultural power of Egypt, overtly retained in the first fifty years of Macedonian rule, appears to have disappeared by 282 BCE. Ptolemaic military concern with Egyptians only revived in the aftermath of the Egyptian victory of Raphia in 217 BCE, and no Lagid learnt to speak Egyptian before Cleopatra VII.

There was, however, another side to this apparent hellenization. Egyptians and Egyptian culture and religion persisted throughout this

[1] These shifts should not be exaggerated as a substantial legal compendium existed in Demotic from the reign of Philadelphos: see Mattha 1975.

third century peak of Hellenistic Hellenism. When Ptolemy II married his sister Arsinoe, they were following the Egyptian practice.[2] The symbolic importance and political aspects of the match were less to do with the parallel with Zeus and Hera than the parallel with Osiris and Isis.[3] In Greek they were the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί; in the Demotic of the Canopus Decree they were *nꜣ nṯrw snw*, 'the Brother and Sister Gods.'[4] There was also the continued patronage of Egyptian temples, and representations of the Ptolemaic rulers as pharaohs.

Even one of the most apparently Hellenic aspects of Alexandria could well have had an Egyptian precedent. Museums had existed in fourth century Greece, but by far the most famous was that founded by Philadelphos in Alexandria. It is hard to believe that this and the earlier *mouseia* were not inspired by the *pr ʿnḫ*, 'House of Life', an Egyptian institution dating back to the Middle Kingdom. These were clearly flourishing in the Persian and early Ptolemaic periods.[5] Scholars differ on the range of studies conducted in them, but they certainly included medicine, magic, dream interpretation, astronomy and mathematics. The Alexandrian Museum was closely associated with the Library. Similarly, the *pr ʿnḫ* contained libraries or collections of scrolls written or copied by scribes. In the Demotic Canopus Decree there are frequent references to *nꜣ sḫw (n) mḏy nṯr jrm nꜣ sḫw (n) pr ʿnḫ*, 'the scribes of the holy book(s) and the scribes of the House of Life'. They were responsible for rituals:[6]

> At the festivals and other processions of the other gods: in accordance with the hymns which the scribes of the House of Life are to write and will give to the instructor singers copies of, which will be written in the books of the House of Life.

The *pr ʿnḫ* even appears to have had authority over neologisms: "spell out the name of Berenice *(Brnygꜣ)* according to the characters of the House of Life".[7]

Few classicists would accept a close relationship between the *pr ʿnḫ* and the Μουσεῖον. Nevertheless, the general tendency among scholars

---

[2] For a demolition of the view that the Ptolemaic brother-sister marriage could have been derived from Greek traditions, see the chapter by Kostas Buraselis in this volume.

[3] See Green 1990, 145–146, and Stephens 2003, 15 n. 43.

[4] Canopus Decree: pp. 224–241 in Simpson 1996. Simpson's transcription is into Middle Egyptian.

[5] See Derchain 1965, Lichtheim 1980, 36 n., and Clagett 1992, 32–36.

[6] Simpson 1996, 241.

[7] Simpson 1996, 239.

today is to see interaction between the two cultures, even when they appear most Hellenic. Dorothy Thompson has shown that taking Greek names and writing in Greek did not cut Egyptians off from their cultural roots.[8] Work by Merkelbach, Koenen, Stephens and others has demonstrated with some intricacy that there was an Egyptian stratum beneath even the most 'Hellenic' Alexandrian religion and literature.[9]

Interpretatio Graeca

When traditionalists attack the new consensus they imply that the champions of hybridity are merely returning to the old bugbear the *interpretatio Graeca*. The *interpretatio Graeca* is a formulation devised by nineteenth-century classicists to label what they saw as the absurd and unscientific idea that Egypt was central to the formation of Greek civilization. It might seem paradoxical that men who adored every other aspect of Hellenic culture and creativity should despise the Greek historiography on this crucial issue. However, the paradox is easily explained by the romantic-racial intellectual climate in which the founders of Classics were formed, and which they helped develop.

Susan Stephens firmly rejects the charge that she champions the *interpretatio Graeca*.[10] In this way she stays within the bounds of her discipline, but flies in the teeth of the Ptolemaic *Zeitgeist*. While the poets touched lightly, if at all, on the image of Greece's Egyptian origins, the three Greek historians dominant on such issues in the last three centuries BCE, Herodotos, Hekataios of Abdera and Diodoros Sikeliotes, all saw Egyptian settlements in Greece. Herodotos maintained that Egyptians and Syrians had acquired territories in the Eastern Peloponnese, and that Kadmos and Phoenicians had founded the Greek Thebes. It is difficult to disentangle Hekataios (writing in the initial Ptolemaic period, with its openness towards Egypt) from Diodoros (writing during the dynasty's final decades).[11] But one or the other, and probably both, appear to have believed not merely in Herodotos' claims of Egyptian and Phoenician colonisation in the Eastern Peloponnese

[8] Thompson 1994, 67–83.
[9] Merkelbach 1977; Koenen 1993; Stephens 2003.
[10] Stephens 2003, 7 n. 14.
[11] For a recent survey of later scholars' disputes on the extent to which Diodoros excerpted from Hekataios see Stephens 2003, 32 n. 35.

and Boiotia, but also that Athens too had been an Egyptian colony—even though they put this scheme in the mouths of Egyptian priests.[12]

These histories were not created for the convenience of those Ptolemies who wanted to bring about Greek and Egyptian cultural synthesis. Herodotos was writing over a century before Alexander's conquests. Plato's views of a special relationship between Athena and Neith and Athens and Sais (*Ḥt-nṯr* (*nt*) *Nt*)—though the poet improbably saw the Greek city as the mother of the Egyptian one—also anticipated the conqueror.[13] In general the three historians saw Egyptian religion as the basis of that of Greece. There are other pre-Ptolemaic correspondences between Egyptian and Greek divinities: Am(m)on and Zeus, Osiris and Dionysos, Horos and Apollo, Ptah and Hephaistos, and Isis and Demeter.

Modern scholars have generally denied the significance of Egyptian scarabs and a symbol of Isis from the ninth or eighth centuries having been found at Demeter's cult centre at Eleusis.[14] Nevertheless, when combined with the resemblances between the mystery and initiations in the cult of Demeter at Eleusis they persuaded a number of the most distinguished specialists of the twentieth century CE to follow the ancient traditions that the cult of Demeter was imported to Eleusis from the East, or specifically Egypt, before the Trojan War or during what we should now call the Late Bronze Age. The most notable of these was the French classicist Paul Foucart, who dominated Eleusinian studies in the early part of the twentieth century and whose detailed work is still respected, even by the most conventional.[15] A later French ancient historian, Charles Picard, is generally supposed to have refuted Foucart. However, even Picard admitted that "well before" the eighth century, the Eleusinian Mysteries had received substantial influence from Egypt.[16] In 1971, the British scholar A.A. Barb also saw fundamental connections.[17] The firm isolationist Jean Hani admitted when referring to Isis and Demeter: "It seems that there has always been a type of *con-*

[12] Diodoros 1.28,4–6.
[13] Plato *Timaeus* 21E–22C.
[14] Snodgrass 1971, 116–117.
[15] Foucart 1914. For the conventional respect see Kern 1926, 136 n. 1, where he wrote, 'One can only be sincerely sorry that such a significant scholar as Paul Foucart should hold this error.'
[16] Picard 1927.
[17] Barb 1971, 159.

nivence "understanding" between Greece and Egypt since prehistory".[18] In a preliminary footnote Susan Stephens argues:[19]

> 'Contact between Greece and Egypt certainly took place from the Mycenean period but what residue it left in Archaic and Classical Greece is disputed and unimportant for this argument. I am concerned only with material that could have directly shaped the Hellenistic experience.'

Nevertheless, she quotes Peter Fraser at length on the Eleusinian mysteries in Alexandria:[20]

> Though we may reject the notion that the Alexandrian festival produced the Eleusinian Mysteries, it is quite likely that the festival contained recitations, perhaps even dramatic scenes, concerning the Eleusinian story. Egyptian traditions preserved by Greek writers, which derived important elements of the Attic worship of Demeter from Egypt, may have played a significant role here. Not only did Herodotus record that the Thesmophoria were introduced into Attica by the daughters of Danaus [2.171]; more significantly for our immediate context, Hecataeus of Abdera… reported "the Egyptians" as claiming that the Athenians derived most of the major items of Athenian life from Egypt, including the Eleusinian Mysteries [Diodorus Siculus I.29]; and, in particular, that the Eumolpidae were of Egyptian priestly origin. The circulation of such theories in Egypt may have assisted the introduction of Egyptian or Egyptianized elements into the new cult.

Thus in the case of the Eleusinian Mysteries, it would seem permissible to make three connections:

1. that there is substantial cultic and archaeological evidence indicating that there were profound pre-Ptolemaic connections, between the Greek Mysteries and Egyptian cults,
2. that there was a strong Greek tradition that the cult at Eleusis had derived from Egypt and many Greeks knew or believed this to be the case; and finally
3. that this belief or knowledge had a significant impact on Ptolemaic religion.

The first connection can be reinforced through a tool not used by Foucart and his colleagues: that of etymology. A number of Eleusinian names and terms exist lacking Indo-European cognates but explicable in terms of Ancient Egyptian or West Semitic. To begin with there

[18] Hani 1976, 9.
[19] Stephens 2003, 20 n. 1.
[20] Fraser 1972 vol. 1, 201, quoted in Stephens 2003, 247–248.

is the word μυστήριον itself. It is conventionally described as deriving from an Indo-European root *mū, which means to 'close the lips' or 'stay mute', found in the Greek μύω 'keep silent'.[21] Keeping silence is certainly an important aspect of mysteries. However, this proposed etymology only explains the first syllable of the term. It would seem more plausible to follow the nineteenth century scholars Jacob Levy and Otto Keller, who derived it from the Semitic root √str 'cover, veil, hide'; possibly, as Keller suggested, from the Canaanite Hophal participle *mastår, 'caused to be hidden'.[22] Against Keller's specific proposal, if μυστήριον comes from Semitic it is more likely to derive from √str with nominalizing or localizing prefix *m-*. This is attested in the Hebrew *mastêr* 'hiding, the act of hiding'; *mistōr* 'place of hiding, shelter'; *mistår* 'secret place, hiding place'.

The challenge to the Indo-European origin of such a central element in Greek culture caused some anxiety among supporters of the Aryan Model. For an example of this see the bullying statement by the nineteenth century German Semitist H.L. Fleischer, in his notes to Levy:[23]

> With the indubitably pure Greek origin of the words μύστης and μυστήριον from μυέω (μύω), μύζω, it would be better to stop even the mere suggestion of the origin, sometimes sought, of these words from *str*.

In fact, the Semitic origin of μυστήριον is not certain. According to the specialist on Egyptian religion Sotirios Mayassis, it comes from the Egyptian root √*šṯꜣ*.[24] This is, of course, cognate to the Semitic √str, as are the nominalizing and localizing prefixes *m-*. However, *m* also occurred independently as the locative preposition. Thus *m šṯꜣ* 'in secret' is attested.[25] The causative *sšṯꜣ* was central to the Osiran 'mystery' cult.[26] Given the overwhelming literary and other evidence

[21] Chantraine is almost certainly right to dismiss the idea that it came from a need by the initiate, to close or half close his eyes.

[22] Levy 1866, vol. 2, 55 col. 2, and Keller 1877, 356.

[23] Levy (Fleischer), *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch* 1881, 568 col. 2. Muss-Arnold, who is sceptical of the Semitic etymology, quotes Fleischer's statement with approval (1892, 53).

[24] Mayassis 1957. For a detailed study of the centrally important Egyptian concept of *(s)šṯꜣ* 'hidden, secret', see Rydstrom (1994). I accept, here, the new conventional view that the /ꜣ/ was originally a liquid /l/ or /r/ and only lost this value in the late New Kingdom.

[25] Six times: Erman-Grapow vol. 4, 554.

[26] Griffiths, 'Concept of Divine Judgement'.

connecting the Greek mysteries to Egypt rather than to the Levant, it would seem much more likely that it came from *m šṯꜣ*.

Connections with Egypt can also be found in the special vocabulary used in the Greek mystery. These include: the *Anaktórion*, a small chamber at Eleusis containing the *hierá* (sacred objects), which can be plausibly derived from the Egyptian euphemistic use of *ʿnḫ* as 'sarcophagus', 'that of the living', used particularly of Osiris, and containing objects of great sanctity. The whole was central to the Osiran mysteries.[27] *Athēr*, 'ear of wheat', in Egypt sacred to Osiris, could well come from *nṯr* 'divinity'.[28] Then there is the likelihood that *páx* in the cry πάξ, κόγξ at the moment of initiation derives from *bs* 'initiate'.[29] τελετή, 'initiation into the mysteries', came from the root *tel*—and the Egyptian (*r*) *ḏr*.[30]

---

[27] See Guilmot 1977, 113–116.

[28] Despite the fact that in most of these cases the *-r-* could be morphological, a possibility remains that it is part of the root that has been dropped elsewhere. A prothetic *˜i* can be seen in the Coptic plural forms *entēr* (B), *ntēr* (S), 'gods'. For a discussion of Greek borrowings from *nṯr* see Moore (ed.), *Black Athena Writes Back*,129–132.

[29] The /s/ with which Bēs' name is usually written, , was etymologically a voiceless dental fricative /s/. By contrast, the hieroglyph was originally a voiced /z/. The two phonemes merged as /s/ in the Middle Kingdom. As the name Bēs is only attested from the late New Kingdom, its earlier pronunciation is uncertain. Takács (2001) writes about this: 'etymology risky due to the unknown OEg sibilant.' Taking it as the unvoiced sibilant, his preferred etymology is tenuously attested parallel word *bs* 'orphan', 'foundling'; the semantic connection with Bēs requires some convolutions.

If, on the other hand, one posits that that the early form was **bz* there are many fruitful links with other Afroasiatic roots. Before discussing these, it is necessary to consider other words attested in Middle Egyptian which are written *bs* with uncertainty as to which s, (s⟩s or z⟩s), to use. *bsi* was 'to flow or spring forth' (of water) and medically 'to swell' and 'bodily discharge'. *bsꜣ* was 'to protect', and in the phrase *mw bsꜣ* 'water of protection', it was 'mother's milk'. All these have strong connotations of physical birth. However, *bs* itself meant 'introduce someone into'; 'install as a king'; 'initiate, reveal a secret to', and 'secret' itself.

[30] The Egyptian root *ḏr* has as its basic meaning 'limit, end'. It is frequently used concretely in space, as in *ḏr* 'obstacle', *ḏrỉ* 'enclosing wall' and *ḏrw* 'boundary'. *ḏr* and *ḏrw* are, however, also used more abstractly in such phrases as *r ḏr.f*, literally, 'to its end' and meaning 'entire' or 'complete'. This also matches derivatives of τέλος and τέλλω as well as their derivatives, such as τελετή, concerning initiation. *nb r ḏr*, 'Lord to the End', was used of gods and kings both spatially and temporarily. *ḏrỉ* 'strong, hard' is used in the sense of 'thorough', 'to press through to the end'. *ḏr* is used verbally through time to mean 'end up as'. This sense closely resembles that of the Homeric τελέθω, 'come into being, become, be'. The phonetic fit is tightened by the general Coptic rendition of *r-ḏr* as the prepronominal forms of *tēr*=, Old Coptic *ter*=. and the Fayumic *tēl*=.

The graphic sign for *ḏr* is of a basket brimming with fruit presumably indicating

Two other terms central to the Eleusinian mysteries are κάλαθος (5) and κίστη (H). These also have plausible Egyptian etymologies. Émile Chassinat described the rites described at the Ptolemaic temple at Denderah, at which a reliquary from Abydos was supposedly used. This consisted of an *ỉnswty* ('basket of rushes'), containing a vase (*qrḥt*) which held the sacred and crowned head of Osiris.[31] Clement of Alexandria wrote:[32]

> The formula of the Eleusinian mysteries is as follows: I fasted, I drank the draught; I took from the chest (κίστη) having done my task I placed in the basket (κάλαθος) and from the basket into the chest.

The inscriptions of the mystery of Osiris at Denderah contain the following passage:[33]

> This pot (*qrḥt*) is placed in his [the priest's] hands and he says: "I am Horus who comes to your ladyship. I bring you these [things] of my father [Osiris]."

Plutarch referred to a festival that seemed to involve something similar:[34]

> On the night of the nineteenth day they go down to the sea and the priests take out the sacred box (κίστη) which has inside a golden casket (κιβώτιον). Into this they pour some drinking water which they have brought with them and the people present shout 'Osiris has been found'.

---

fulfilment. This would seem very similar in semantics to τελεόω, and τελεσφορέω, 'bring fruit to maturity'. There is also τελειγονέω, 'produce fruit in perfection, or in due season'. Given the abstractions developed for *ḏr* in other senses and the Egyptian delight in metaphysics I see no reason to doubt that many of the abstractions on the theme of fruit found with the Greek τελ- had already developed in Egypt around *ḏr*. For more on this see Bernal *Black Athena* vol. 3 (2006), chapter 10.

[31] For a detailed discussion of this see Chassinat 1934, 495–497 and 587–595. See also Griffiths 1975, 222 and Guilmot 1977, 115.

[32] Clement *Protrepticus*, Butterworth 1919, 43.

[33] Cols. 122–123, Chassinat 1934, 774.

[34] Plutarch *De Iside* 39 (366D), trans. Griffiths 1970, 181. Vycichl (1984) wrote a thoughtful note on the Coptic borrowing from the Greek *kibōtos* 'coffer, box'. He pointed out that the Greek word has no etymology but is likely to have been borrowed from Semitic. He cites the Hebrew *tēba* 'coffer, box'. Vycichl noted an Old Egyptian word *ṯb* 'cage, case for birds' from which he reconstructed a form *kiba or *kuba, which he saw as 'very close to the Greek word'. Cerny attempted to explain the Coptic words *taibe* and *tēēbe* 'coffin, shrine, chest'. He was inclined to see them as deriving from two Egyptian roots *ḏbꜣt* 'shrine, coffin', and *dbt* 'chest, box'. Vycichl's conclusion is that although 'the links cannot be formally demonstrated, the use of sufficiently similar words … speaks rather in favor of a common origin.'

In the *Golden Ass*, Apuleius mentioned a priest in the mysterious procession carrying a box, *cista*, holding "secret things and concealing within it the hidden attributes of the sublime faith".[35]

Can *kálathos* be derived from *qrḥt*? *Kálathos* has a bewildering array of meanings. Primarily it is a narrow-based basket carried in rituals of Demeter. It also part of the terminology of the Eleusinian mysteries.[36] In the same way *qrḥt* as a pot was used in the Osiran ceremonies recorded at the Ptolemaic temple at Denderah.[37] *Kálathos*, however, can also mean 'capital of a pillar', and the diminutive *kalathískos* is the 'coffering or sealing of a room or box.' Another borrowing from *qrḥt* would seem to be κάρταλλος, 'a small pointed basket'. The suffix seems to be a diminutive. Beyond mentioning a possible relationship to κυρτός, 'curved', Chantraine offers no explanation but Pokorny links *kálathos* to κλώθω 'spin'.[38] The significance of the *kálathoi*, however, seems not to be from the material from which they are made but their shape, narrow at the bottom. This would make it parallel to the *qrḥt*, the same shape as the head of a cobra (Gardiner I13), meaning 'serpent spirit as guardian', also *qrḥt*. In Coptic the term *kalahē* means 'breast, stomach or womb'. Vycichl follows Crum in maintaining that it is made up of *kala* ⟨*qrḥt* and *hē*, 'belly or womb'. Sauneron, however, believes that *kalahē* is *qrḥt*, the womb or egg of the primordial cobra goddess, from which all life emanates.[39] It is interesting to note that in imperial times many Isiac baskets, caskets and chests were represented with snakes. Gwyn Griffiths plausibly gave these an Egyptian origin.[40] Given the semantic parallels and the Coptic phonetic development, the derivation of *kálathos* from *qrḥt* seems likely. The final *-t* would be aspirated by the previous /*ḥ*/. The borrowing could have taken place before final *-t*s were dropped or later re-inserted as an archaism, very common in religious contexts.

At this point we should turn to κίστη (H) itself. The normal translation is 'basket'; however, it was sometimes made of bark, and the loan into Latin *cista* 'box' or 'chest' suggests that these meanings were already present in Greek. The Latin *cista*, from which many

[35] Apuleius 11.27 (trans. Griffiths 1975, 83).
[36] Clement of Alexandria *Protrepticus* 2.18.
[37] Denderah inscriptions cols. 122–124, trans. Chassinat 1966–1968, 774.
[38] Pokorny 1969, 611. Chantraine gives no etymology of κλώθω. The Egyptian *kꜣwt*, 'craft, profession' is a possibility.
[39] Vycichl 1984, 80.
[40] Griffiths 1975, 223–224.

Celtic words and Teutonic words descend, including the English, 'case', 'chest' and 'cist', is generally acknowledged to be a loan from κίστη, probably through Etruscan. The only possible Indo-European cognate for κίστη is the dubious Old Irish *ciss*, 'basket'. This too is more likely to be a loan from *cista*.[41] In any event, the better attested Irish word *ciste* must be a borrowing. Given the religious context this would seem more likely. Chantraine is uncertain and concludes that it may be a loan. It is possible that there is also ambiguity between box, hamper or basket on the Afroasiatic side. Orel and Stolbova postulate a root *kič, 'basket' or 'container', found in West Chadic and Central and Eastern Cushitic.[42] Whether or not it is related, the Egyptian *qrst*, 'burial', *qrsw*, 'coffin', and *qrstt*, 'funeral equipment', are all written with (Q6). In Late Egyptian there is *qrst*, 'coffin, box-shaped sarcophagus'. *qst* is 'burial' and 'embalmment' in Demotic. *qrsw*, 'coffin' is written *kaise, kese* (S) and *kaisi* (B) in Coptic. Vycichil reconstructs a sequence **qirsat* 〉 **qiasat*. *qrst*, 'burial', became *kōōs*, suggesting an original /āā/; its qualitative or completed form is *kēs*.[43] Thus either, at some point in the Late Bronze Age when the final /-t/ was still pronounced, provides good etyma **ke/ist* for *kistē*.

Εὐμολπίδαι and Κήρυκες: Eumolpids and Kērukes

It is well known that compared to Egypt Greece had fewer priests and less priesthoods. At Eleusis, however, there were two important priesthoods—the Εὐμολπίδαι, Eumolpids, and the Κήρυκες, *Kērukes*. I believe that the first had an ultimately Semitic name and the second an Egyptian one. For the ancients there was no doubt that the cult of Demeter and the mysteries associated with her, came from abroad. The Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* portrays the goddess arriving at Eleusis to be welcomed by the local notables including Eumolpos, the epony-

---

[41] Even accepting the form *ciss* or *cess*, a loan is more likely. Final vowels fell away very early in Old Irish and final -st became -s, which was uncertain in Ogam inscriptions and disappeared in later Irish. See Thurneysen, [1949] 1993, 110 §177. Thus the preservation of the geminated *-ss* would seem to indicate a borrowing from the Latin *cista*.

[42] Orel and Stolbova 1995, 317 §1454.

[43] *kōōs* appears in Greek as γόος (H) 'funeral, lament' from which the verb γοάω, 'lament' derived. Chantraine distinguishes this from βοάω, 'call', and tries to link γόος to **kaujan*, a Germanic form for 'name, call'.

mous founder of the family of the Eumolpids, who with the less important clan of the Kerykes provided priests for the cult throughout antiquity.[44] On the other hand, Plutarch, Pausanias and Lucian claimed that Eumolpos had come from Thrace to Eleusis to found the cult.[45] Apollodoros maintained that he was brought up in Ethiopia.[46]

Against these, Diodorus' Egyptian informants told him that the Eumolpids derived from Egyptian priests, and the Kerykes from the lesser rank of the *pastophoroi*. They also claimed that the mysteries had been introduced to Eleusis by Erekhtheus, whom they saw as the Egyptian king of Attika during his reign *c.* 1409/8 BCE.[47] The Parian Marble agreed with this date. Apollodoros, however, put the arrival of Demeter and Dionysos somewhat earlier, during the reign of king Pandion.[48] Either date would fit the apogee of the eighteenth dynasty. Despite these differences of opinion, there was no dispute over the identification of Demeter with Isis, and Dionysos with Osiris. To return to Eumolpos and the Eumolpids, despite the widespread attribution of their Thracian origin, they themselves believed they had Egyptian origins and had preserved Egyptian traditions. The significance of these traditions in summoning of the Eumolpid Timotheus for consultation on the formation—or reformation—of the cult of Serapis has been mentioned above.

Connections between Eumolpos and Egypt are strengthened by the clearly Egyptian origin of Μελάμπους. Taking away the prefix *eu*, and the common nasal dissimilation *p⟩mp*, leaves the same consonantal structure *mlp*. The two men also had remarkably similar legendary functions. Melampus, thought to mean 'black foot', was associated with μελάμβροτες, 'negroes'. The view of Egypt as a land of magic and medicine was almost universal in antiquity. Thus Melampus as an Egyptian may well be the legendary ancestor of the hero in the *Odyssey* who was a skilled diviner and understood the language of animals.[49] According to Pherekydes and Herodotos, it was through his

[44] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 151–155.
[45] See Plutarch *De exilio* 17; Pausanias 1.38,2 and Lucian *Demonax* 34.
[46] Apollodoros 3.15.4.
[47] Diodoros 1.29.4.
[48] Apollodoros, 3.14.7. For a discussion of the dates, see Burton 1972, 125. Consistently with her general inclination, she prefers a northern origin for the mysteries to one from Egypt or Crete.
[49] Homer *Odyssey* 15.225–226, and 11.291–294.

ability to cure madness that Melampus acquired five-sixths of Argos.[50] This is very interesting in the light of other traditions referring to the Egypto-Syrian acquisition of the Eastern Peloponnese.[51] According to Herodotos, this Melampus was supposed to have brought the name and worship of Dionysos, and in particular his phallic processions, from Egypt to Greece.[52] Clement of Alexandria enlarged on this to write that it was Melampus who introduced the festivals of Demeter and her grief to Greece from Egypt.[53]

Without the nasal dissimilation, *mrp/mlp* points more to the Levant than to Egypt. Μέροψ was the legendary first king of Kos with its strong medical and later Hippocratic tradition. Traces of Merops as a skilled healer are found all over Greece, but especially in connection with the worship of Ἀσκλήπιος. Michael Astour has provided detailed evidence of their derivation from the West Semitic root √*rp*', 'heal' and the attested name Baʿal mərappe' 'healer'.[54] He has also connected these to *Marapijo*, a personal name found from Knossos. Oscar Landau, however, sees this as Melampus or Melampios.[55] These explanations are not necessarily exclusive. The name Melampus may well have been influenced by *mélas, mélanos*, 'black', and hence Egypt. Like Merops it probably derived from *mərappe',* Melampus with a nasal dissimilation, before the 'Canaanite shift', ā⟩ō, and Merops after it.

In the city of Megara, Melampus was thought to have been an early settler and was closely associated with the temple of Dionysos. Nearby in Αἰγόσθενα Pausanias reported that Melampus was worshipped as a god, a claim that has been confirmed by inscriptions.[56] The initial element of Aigosthena is *aix, aigos*, 'goat'. There is no reason to doubt the belief of the early twentieth-century classicist A.B. Cook, that Melampus was a form of Dionysos as a goat and as a healer, especially from madness.[57]

---

[50] Pherekydes fr. 24 (Müller, 1841–1851, vol. 1, 74f.) and Herodotos 9.34.

[51] See *Black Athena* vol. 1, 88–103.

[52] Herodotos 2.49.

[53] Clement *Protrepticus* 2.13.

[54] Astour 1967, 239. The Arabic *rāfā* and the Ge'ez *rf⟩* mean 'stitch together'. This provides a plausible etymology for the Greek ῥάπτω, 'sew'. The discovery of a Mycenaean *erapamena* has ruined previous attempts to establish an Indo-European etymology.

[55] Landau 1958, 80. On p. 215, however, he follows Chadwick's identification with the Persian tribe Maraphioi.

[56] Pausanias 1.43.5 and *IG* VII.223–224.

[57] Cook 1914–1920 vol. 2, 544.

Megara is only ten miles to the west of Eleusis. Can Eumolpos be linked to Melampus, the Dionysian ecstatic diviner and healer, to Merops, also a healer, and the Semitic *mərappe'*? Paul Foucart derived Eumolpos from *melpō*, 'dance, sing', *molpē*, 'song', and *mólpos* 'singer, musician'. He went further to claim that Eumolpos, 'good singer' was a *calque* for *mꜣʿ ḫrw*, 'true of voice', used in the acclamations of Osiris and Horus.[58] Whether or not this is the case, there is a link between *mo/elp* and Dionysos. Pausanias noted:[59]

> In it [a colonnade near the Temple of Demeter in Athens] too, is the house of Pulytion in which they say some illustrious Athenians parodied the Eleusinian mysteries; but in my time it was consecrated to Dionysos. This Dionysos was called 'the minstrel Melpomenos'.

Although *mo/elp* sometimes referred to secular music and dance, it was more often associated with ritual and ecstasy. As it has no Indo-European etymology, it would seem plausible to derive it from *mərap-pe'*.[60] This appears to have another Greek derivative, μορφ-, which also lacks a plausible Indo-European alternative.[61] It is believed to have a basic meaning of 'shape'. Such an interpretation, however, contains serious anomalies. μορφὴ only occurs twice in Homer, where it is usually translated as 'beautiful' or 'graceful'. In both cases, however, it was used to describe the power of eloquence to move others, with a sense of verbal conjuring.[62]

In later writings where it is used to signify 'form' it frequently refers to the shape of fantasies in dreams. This seems to have been the origin of Ovid's Morpheus, the son of sleep and the bringer of

---

[58] Foucart 1914, 149.

[59] Pausanias 1.2.4, trans. Frazer 1898. The blaspheming villain was, as usual, Alcibiades. For a bibliography on the house and Dionysos Melpomenos, see Frazer vol. 2, 50.

[60] Frisk states: 'without an etymology', and goes on to list some hypotheses he does not accept. Chantraine writes that phonetically 'it seems to have an Indo-European origin', but simply cites, without comment, some of those referred to by Frisk. Both scholars are sceptical of Szemerényi's attempt (1955, 159–165) to link it to μέλος, 'music'. This too has no Indo-European etymology. It would seem plausible to derive it from an Egyptian root *mr possibly attested in *mrt*, 'female singer', or 'musician' (Erman-Grapow vol. 2, 107) and certainly found in *Mrt*, a goddess of music.

[61] Pokorny (1969, 753) links it to a root *mer* 'shimmer, sparkle'. Chantraine tentatively accepts a relationship with the Latin *fōrma*, despite the necessity of metathesis and difficulties with the long *ō*. He also admits that Ernout sees *fōrma* as a borrowing from morf-, possibly through Etruscan. In short, both scholars see both words as loans.

[62] Homer *Odyssey* 7.170 and 9.367.

dreams.[63] μορφὴ also means 'gesticulation'. The derived verb *morphazō*, 'gesticulate', has the nominal form *morphásmos*, 'dance in imitation of animals'. Thus the fundamental sense of *morph* is not 'shape', but rather that of *morphóomai*, 'take a form' *morphoō* and *metamorphoō*, 'give shape and transform', in a magical way through dance and song.

Greeks believed that Egyptian gods and men were skilled in magical transformations. In the *Odyssey*, 'the immortal Proteus of Egypt' was capable of taking any kind of shape.[64] Osiris, under his later name as Serapis, was well known as a performer of miracles who could change his form as well as carrying out the related role as healer.[65] Isis' association with magical change and healing was even stronger. The classic instance of this was in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in which the hero Lucius was transformed from being a donkey back to his human shape through Isiac ritual and the goddess's love and power.[66] Fifteen hundred years earlier in the *Contendings of Horus and Seth*, Isis transformed herself into an old woman, a maid, a bird (a kite) and a headless statue.[67] Similar transformations are described of Demeter in the Homeric Hymn dedicated to her.[68] Diodoros quoted Egyptians who told him that Isis had discovered many drugs and had resurrected her dead son Horus and made him immortal.[69] This was clearly in a very ancient tradition. In the *Pyramid Texts*, inscribed two thousand five hundred years earlier, Isis and her sister double Nepthys arrived 'with healing on their wings, to heal and resuscitate Osiris'.[70] Thus there is no doubt that Isis' association with healing and revivifying far antedated any possible Greek influence.[71]

To sum up: Melampus, *mo/elp*, Merops and morph—all seem to derive from the West Semitic *mrp*', 'cure, shaman, ritual healer'. Despite the Semitic etymology, however, all the terms with the possible exception of Merops have Egyptian associations and are linked in some way to Isis/Demeter and Osiris/Dionysos. Eumolpos and Melampus were specifically tied to the introduction and identification of Greek

---

[63] Ovid *Metamorphoses* 21.633–674.
[64] Homer *Odyssey* 4.385–460.
[65] Griffiths 1975, 236–237.
[66] Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 11.13.
[67] Griffiths 1960, 102 and 116.
[68] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 275–281.
[69] Diodoros 1.25.2–6.
[70] *Pyramid Text* Utterance 365.
[71] See Burton 1972, 109 and Harris 1971, 112–137.

and Egyptian cults. Even though they claimed to be, and in many respects actually were, inhibited by religious scruples, Herodotos and Hekataios-Diodoros were able to provide specific proofs of the connection. Furthermore, increasing knowledge of Egyptian religion during the nineteenth century, especially the translation of various recensions of the *Book of Coming Forth by Day*, showed striking similarities between the two systems.[72] Thus it is not surprising that the names Eumolpos and Eumolpid should have a plausible Afroasiatic origin.

The other, lesser, priesthood at Eleusis was that of the Κήρυκες or Κηρυκίδαι. The name is obviously linked to κῆρυξ, κήρυκος, 'herald', the origin of which is from the Egyptian *qꜣ ḫrw* 'high, loud of voice', one who announces the rituals or sacrifices.[73]

The crone goddess Hekate was central to the Eleusinian Mysteries, whose name like that of nearly all Greek divinities has no Indo-European etymology. Her name almost certainly derives from Egyptian frog goddess *Ḥkt* or *Ḥqt*. Both were versed in magic—*ḥkꜣ* in Egyptian—and fertility. There is, to my knowledge, only one connection drawn between Hekate and frogs. This comes in Aristophanes' parody of the Eleusinian initiation, *The Frogs*, where the chorus condemns those who defile Hekate's shrine.[74] The chorus of frogs appears while the travellers are crossing to Hades on Kharon's ferry. In the Egyptian *Coffin Texts* of the Middle Kingdom, Sokar's ferry to the Underworld is reported to have "her bailers… [as] the frog goddess *Ḥqt* at the mouth of her lake".[75]

Conclusion

Given the plausible claims for Egyptian origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries based on other evidence, from resemblances between the cults, the Greek tradition and archaeological finds, the density of plausible Egyptian and Semitic etymologies in the terminology of the Greek cult makes the case for the connection very hard to refute.[76] I proposed Egyptian and Semitic etymologies for other Greek divine

[72] See Foucart 1914, and Bernal 2001, 386–389.
[73] See Bernal 2006, chapter 17 n. 37.
[74] Aristophanes *Frogs* 367.
[75] Faulkner *Coffin Texts* vol. 2, p. 34; spell 208.
[76] For further proposed etymologies in this area see Bernal 2006, chapters 18 and 19.

and mythological names and religious terms in the first two volumes of *Black Athena*. These and many more now appear in volume 3, certainly enough to confirm Herodotos' statement that "the names of nearly all the gods came to Greece from Egypt".[77] Thus although the evidence is particularly clear in the Eleusinian case, it should not be seen as exceptional or anomalous. The three connections proposed above appear to have been made:

1. that there is substantial cultic, archaeological and etymological evidence indicating that there were profound connections;
2. that there was a strong Greek tradition that the cult at Eleusis had derived from Egypt, and many Greeks knew or believed this to be the case; and finally
3. that this belief or knowledge had a significant impact on Ptolemaic religion.

These connections do not necessitate Greeks in the Ptolemaic period having been aware that many of their sacred names and terms had Egyptian origins. Nevertheless, the acceptance of the three historians makes it clear that in a general way Hellenistic Greeks believed that Egypt was the source of their religious culture. Although they found it difficult to classify Egyptians as 'barbarians', these cultural origins do not appear to have affected their own sense of political, cultural and even religious superiority over their Egyptian subjects. Ptolemy Soter did not rely on an Egyptian priest to supervise the new cult of Serapis, but the Eumolpid Timotheus. The best analogy I can find for the Macedonian rule of Egypt is that of the Japanese rule over much of China in the Second World War. The conquerors knew that much of their culture derived from the conquered, but they were convinced not only that they were superior in power and morality, but that in some ineffable way they had preserved the ancient culture better than those who had created it.

[77] Herodotos 2.50. The names with plausible Egyptian etymologies include Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Enyalios, Hephaistos, Kronos, Ouranos, Plouto, Rhea and Zeus. See Bernal 2006, chapter 19.

ELEPHANTS FOR PTOLEMY II: PTOLEMAIC POLICY IN NUBIA IN THE THIRD CENTURY BC[1]

Stanley M. Burstein

The past half century has seen an outpouring of scholarship on the foreign policy of the early Ptolemies. Important studies have been produced by Édouard Will, Roger Bagnall, Werner Huss, and Brigitte Beyer-Rotthoff to mention only the most significant.[2] As a result, the principal goals of Ptolemaic foreign policy have become clear. In order to forestall attack on the Egyptian core of their empire Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III sought to extend Egypt's defensive perimeter in the Aegean while simultaneously disrupting cooperation between the Antigonids and the Seleucids by securing bases around the coasts of Anatolia and in the Aegean islands and supporting states hostile to Macedon in Greece. Understandably, the main focus of recent scholarship, therefore, has been western Asia and the Aegean. Early Ptolemaic policy in western Asia and the Aegean, however, is only part of the story of Egyptian foreign policy. Largely ignored has been early Ptolemaic activity in another theatre: Nubia. As was true in western Asia and the Aegean, the formative period for Ptolemaic policy in Nubia was the reign of Ptolemy II.

When Ptolemy II intervened in Nubia in the 270s BC, he was following in the footsteps of his Pharaonic predecessors, whose involvement in Nubia dated back to the beginning of Egyptian history. Like them, Ptolemy II found both opportunities and challenges in the region. As the title of William Y. Adam's magisterial history of Nubia[3] puts

---

[1] I would like to thank Professor J.T. Roberts for reading and commenting on an earlier draft of this article. Unattributed translations are by the author. *FHN* = Tormod Eide et al., *Fontes historiae Nubiorum: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*, vol. 2 (Bergen, 1996), *PP* = W. Peremans and E. van 't Dack (eds.), *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* (9 vols., Louvain, 1950–1981); *Urkunden* = Kurt Sethe, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1904).

[2] Will 1979 vol. 1, 153–208. Bagnall 1976. Huss 1976. Beyer-Rotthoff 1993. In this volume, see contributions by Céline Marquaille, James O'Neil and Geoff Adams.

[3] Adams 1977. At present evidence is lacking for the use in the Hellenistic period of two other routes to the African interior: the Nile to Niger trans-Saharan route whose

it, Nubia was Egypt's "corridor to Africa". Through Nubia, Egypt received a large variety of sub-Saharan African goods including gold, slaves, exotic woods, and ivory and other animal products that were essential to the lifestyle of the Egyptian elite and religious cult. Politically, however, Nubia, or more precisely, the Kingdom of Kush located in the central Sudan, was also Egypt's principal rival for domination of the Upper Nile Valley and sometimes of Egypt itself. Traditionally, rulers of Egypt sought to secure access to the products of Nubia and security for Egypt by firmly occupying northern Nubia and forcing peoples further south in the region to recognize Egyptian suzerainty,[4] and the evidence suggests that Ptolemy II followed a similar policy.

The potential for conflict in Nubia was real. The Hellenistic kings of Kush viewed themselves as the heirs of the Nubian kings of Egypt's twenty-fifth dynasty. Like them, they styled themselves Kings of Upper and Lower Egypt, and they hoped to restore their ancestors' preeminence in lower Nubia. Twice already in the fourth century BC kings of Kush had taken advantage of Egyptian weakness to attempt to reassert their authority in lower Nubia. So, early in the century, Harsiyotef had campaigned as far as Syene and asserted his authority over local rulers in lower Nubia.[5] Again, shortly before, or possibly during, the reign of Alexander, Nastasen repeated Harsiyotef's campaign, imposing his authority on local chieftains as far north as Abou Simbel.[6] Not surprisingly, therefore, even before Ptolemy II intervened in Nubia, both Alexander and Ptolemy I had both involved themselves in the region, the former dispatching a scouting expedition during his stay in Egypt under the pretext of searching for the sources of the Nile,[7] and the latter campaigning in Nubia, while he was still officially only satrap of Egypt.[8]

Detailed reconstruction of Ptolemy II's activities in Nubia is unfortunately not possible. As is true of so many aspects of Hellenistic history, the problem lies in the sources. These were once abundant and varied.

---

existence is postulated on the basis of Herodotus 4.181–185 by Liverani 2000; and the route to the Sudan via the western oases that was widely used in the early modern period (cf. Adams 1977, 612).

[4] Cf. Redford 2004, 38–57.

[5] *FHN* vol. 2, no. 78.

[6] *FHN* vol. 2, no. 84.

[7] Cf. Burstein 1995, 63–76.

[8] Satrap Stela: translated by Robert Ritner in Simpson 2003, 393 with note 4.

The royal archives at Alexandria contained reports filed by Ptolemaic agents active in Nubia, such as the explorers Philon[9] and Satyrus,[10] Eumedes,[11] the founder of Ptolemais of the Hunts, and even a garrison commander such as the Egyptian Tosuches[12] who established a fort west of the Red Sea. Some of these men also wrote books based on their experiences; six such works are known, including one by a certain Simonides the Younger,[13] who claimed to have lived in the Kushite capital Meroe for five years. Except for meager fragments, however, all of these primary sources are lost.

Also lost are the synthetic works based on them, such as the *On Harbors* of the Ptolemaic admiral Timosthenes,[14] the *Geography* of the third century BC scholar Eratosthenes[15] and the *On the Erythraean Sea* of the mid-second century BC Peripatetic and minor Ptolemaic official Agatharchides of Cnidus.[16] Extensive fragments of the latter two works are, however, preserved by the historian Diodorus, the geographer Strabo, Pliny the Elder, Aelian, and Photius—but these fragments overwhelmingly concern the geography and ethnography of Nubia, not the history of Ptolemaic activity in the area. While it is not, therefore, possible to give a full account of the history of Ptolemaic activity in Nubia during the third century BC, the surviving evidence is sufficient to establish the main outlines of Ptolemy II's Nubian policy and to assess its goals and achievements.

The one secure fact is that Ptolemy II's Nubian campaign in the 270s BC marked the beginning of large scale Ptolemaic activity in Nubia. Theocritus[17] included it among the major achievements of the first decade of Ptolemy II's independent rule in his poetic panegyric of the king. Agatharchides[18] went further, claiming that prior to Ptolemy II's reign:

---

[9] *PP* 6.16962.
[10] *PP* 2.4427, 16303.
[11] *PP* 2.4420.
[12] Strabo 16.4.8 (C470). Strabo also refers in the same passage to a country in the interior named Tenessis, the Greek form of *T3-Nehsi* (Desanges 1978, 219 n. 14), the Egyptian term for Nubia, which probably comes from the report of an Egyptian officer.
[13] *FGrHist* 666 T.
[14] *PP* 5.13794.
[15] Eratosthenes' account of Nubia is summarized by Strabo 17.1.2 (C786).
[16] For the fragments of Agatharchides' work see Burstein 1989.
[17] Theocritus *Idyll* 17.86–87. On *Idyll* 17 see now Hunter 2003.
[18] As preserved in Diodorus 1.37.5; cf. *FGrHist* 86F19.

> Greeks not only did not cross into Aithiopia, but they did not even travel as far as the borders of Egypt. Conditions in these regions were completely hostile to foreigners and extremely dangerous.

While Agatharchides clearly exaggerated when he claimed that Ptolemy II's incursion marked the beginning of Greek activity in Nubia, he was right that the campaign marked a fundamental change in Ptolemaic policy toward Nubia. Unlike prior Greek interventions in the region, which were isolated events without significant follow-up, Ptolemy II's Nubian campaign opened a period of close contact between Ptolemaic Egypt and the kingdom of Kush that extended from the late 270s BC to the end of the century.

Agatharchides dealt with Ptolemy II's Nubian campaign in the lost first book of *On the Erythraean Sea*.[19] Reconstruction of the course of the campaign, therefore, is not possible. An allusion to a Meroitic raid on Ptolemaic positions near Aswan in a fragmentary third-century papyrus may refer to an episode of the campaign or the run-up to it, or even to an event later in the century.[20] Agatharchides' reference to Ptolemy II recruiting five hundred cavalrymen in the Aegean and equipping the hundred troopers of the vanguard with Kushite style quilted armor to protect themselves and their horses, however, indicates that preparations were on a large scale and suggests that the king's plans involved penetrating the heartland of the kingdom of Kush, which was noted for its formidable cavalry forces.[21] Clearer is the situation concerning the origins of the war and its implications for relations between Ptolemaic Egypt and Kush during the remainder of Ptolemy II's reign.

Like other Greek historians, Agatharchides used speeches to illuminate the issues behind Ptolemy II's decision to launch his invasion of Nubia, and substantial fragments still survive of a speech urging war apparently addressed to Ptolemy II by a now unidentifiable advisor from the first book of the *On the Erythraean Sea*.[22] Although these fragments are preserved because Photius valued them primarily as examples of Agatharchides' rhetorical style, remarks such as 'the law helps the possessor of property of the former sort (sc. private property), but

[19] These fragments have been referred to a hypothetical Nubian campaign of Ptolemy V, but see Burstein 1995, 97–104 for the connection to Ptolemy II.

[20] *FHN* no. 97 =*SB* nr. 5111.

[21] Cf. Heidorn 1997, 105–115.

[22] *On the Erythraean Sea* fragments 12–13 (Burstein).

the sword deprives the weaker of property of the latter sort (sc. a king's property)' and 'your preoccupation with your affairs gives to another ruler the incentive to expand his possessions and diminish those of others' indicate that in Agatharchides' view the pretext for the campaign was renewed Meroitic activity in Lower Nubia; and this concern certainly was reflected in the settlement of the war.

The most important evidence for the terms of the settlement is Theocritus' (*Idyll* 17.86–87) statement that Ptolemy II "cut off a part of Black Aithiopia."[23] Scholars have usually interpreted Theocritus' phrase as indicating that Ptolemy II annexed the Dodekaschoinos, the roughly seventy-five-mile stretch of the Nile immediately south of the first cataract. Occupation of the Dodekaschoinos also meant that Ptolemy II gained control of the important gold mining region east of the Nile in the Wadi Allaqi that provided a significant part of the wealth that underwrote his ambitious foreign policy in the Aegean and western Asia. Moreover, graffiti suggest that Ptolemy II may also have attempted to create a buffer zone for the Dodekaschoinos by temporarily garrisoning the old Middle Kingdom forts at Buhen and Mirgissa near the second cataract.[24] Finally, Ptolemy II designated the Dodekaschoinos to be the estate of the massive temple of Isis he built at Philae as a public statement of his new authority in Nubia.[25]

Since the Kushite monarchy is attested as functioning continuously throughout the Hellenistic Period, scholars have assumed that surrender of the Dodekaschoinos was the extent of Ptolemy II's demands on Kush. Hieroglyphic inscriptions in the temple of Isis at Philae, however, suggest otherwise. In the first inscription,[26] which is found in Room 1 of the temple, Ptolemy II is portrayed as offering to Isis the products of the nomes of Nubia—each nome being represented with its most distinctive product—from Bigga near the first cataract to south of Meroe. In the second inscription, Isis gives Nubia to Ptolemy II, saying "a southern land is given to you in the south stretching as far as the *kns.t stj* area; subordinated to you forever…"[27] that is, as far as the land south of Meroe or, in other words, all of Kush. The temptation to dismiss these inscriptions as merely symbolic should be resisted, since the Rho-

[23] Theocritus *Idyll* 17.86–87; cf. Burstein 1995, 108, and Hunter 2003, 164–165. For the history of the Dodekaschoinos see Török 1980, 76–86.

[24] *FHN* nos. 98–99; cf. Burstein 1995, 108, 118 nn. 16–17.

[25] For the temple of Isis and the Dodekaschoinos see now Dietze 1994, 63–110.

[26] *FHN* no. 112.

[27] *Urkunden* vol. 2, 119, line 26. Translated at Kormysheva 1997, 360.

dian historian Callixeinus[28] reported in his *On Alexandria* on the basis of the records of the Penteteric Festivals that Aithiopian 'gift bearers', that is, 'tribute bearers', marched with their 'gifts' in a spectacular procession Ptolemy II mounted in Alexandria sometime after the Nubian campaign:

> After these came Aithiopian gift-bearers, some of which carried six hundred elephant tusks, and others two thousand logs of ebony, and others sixty mixing bowls full of gold and silver and gold nuggets.

Taken together, the implication of these three texts is clear. Although not put under direct Egyptian rule, Kush became as a result of Ptolemy II's Nubian campaign a 'tributary' state, sending 'gifts' to Egypt a regular intervals as it had done during the New Kingdom and again in the fifth century BC following the Persian king Cambyses' Nubian expedition.[29] As a tributary state, Kush could also be expected to cooperate with Egyptian forces in achieving Ptolemy II's goals in Nubia; and the most important of those goals was his desire to find a secure African source for war elephants.

The military use of elephants was millennia old in Asia. Greeks and Macedonians first encountered them in battle during Alexander's campaign. Although their record of effectiveness in battle was uneven, the Ptolemies and other Hellenistic kings considered these living 'tanks' an essential component of their armies. Ptolemy I had acquired the nucleus of an elephant corps, possibly obtaining some of Alexander's elephants following his victory over Perdiccas in 321 BC, and then capturing forty-three of Demetrius Poliorcetes' elephants and their Indian mahouts at the Battle of Gaza in 312 BC.[30] These animals and their mahouts were, however, a wasting asset, as age increasingly eroded their numbers and battle worthiness.

By contrast, the Ptolemies' Seleucid rivals enjoyed ready access to Indian elephants and mahouts thanks to their good relations with

---

[28] *FGrHist* 627F2.32; cf. Rice 1983, 98. 'Gifts' from Aithiopia are reported ca. 270 BC in the Pithom Stele (translation in Roeder 1959, 125). The procession is generally identified with the Ptolemaieia. Proposed dates range from 279/8 to 262 BC (cf. the recent survey of proposed dates in Thompson 2000, 381–388). Hitherto proposals have been based on external factors to the exclusion of internal factors such as the references to Aithiopians and Aithiopian goods in the procession, which are difficult to reconcile with a date prior to Ptolemy II's Nubian campaign.

[29] Cf. Kormysheva 1997, 359–360. For Nubia and the Persians see Herodotus 3.97.1–2 with Burstein 1995, 155–164.

[30] Perdiccas: Diodorus 18.33–34; Demetrius: Diodorus 19.82–84.

the Maurya rulers of north India. If Ptolemy II was not aware of the potential significance of the Seleucids' Maurya connection, it was certainly made clear to him, when Antiochus I was able to bring fresh elephants from Bactria to Syria in 275 BC just before the outbreak of the First Syrian War.[31] Ptolemy II had no choice, therefore, except to find and to develop an alternative African source for war elephants as well as train new mahouts. He set about this task immediately after the end of the First Syrian War in 271 BC, and his successors continued to pursue it until the great Egyptian revolt of 207–186 BC severed ties between Ptolemaic Egypt and Nubia.

Not surprisingly, the focus of most scholarship on Ptolemaic activity in Nubia has been the elephant hunts themselves.[32] The evidence available for studying Ptolemaic elephant hunting is limited in quantity, but it does include a wide variety of textual, epigraphic, and papyrological sources. The most revealing of these sources is the triumphal inscription Ptolemy III set up after the Third Syrian War at the port of Adulis in present day Eritrea. The original inscription does not survive, but it was copied in the sixth century AD by Cosmas Indicopleustes at the request of the Axumite governor of Adulis. In it Ptolemy III boasted that his army included "elephants, both Trog[l]odytic and Aithiopian", which he claims that he and his father Ptolemy II "first hunted in these countries, and, having brought them back to Egypt, trained for military use."[33]

Despite the brevity of its reference to elephants, the Adulis inscription clearly indicates the scope and nature of Ptolemy II's initiative. Wild elephants were hunted and brought back to Egypt for training from two regions: Trogodytice and Aithiopia. The former term in Ptolemaic sources refers to the African coast of the Red Sea and its hinterlands, and the latter to the Nile Valley south of Egypt. Greek graffiti at Ramses II's great temple at Abou Simbel confirm that elephant hunters hunted elephants using the Nile Valley route.[34] The remoteness, however, of the elephant herds—Ptolemaic scouts first reported signs of elephants near Meroe above the fifth cataract of the Nile, almost

[31] Austin 1981, no. 141.

[32] The most recent and fullest account is Casson, 'Ptolemy II and the Hunting of African Elephants', 247–260. Still useful older accounts are H.H. Scullard 1974, 126–137, and Kortenbeutel 1931, 16–43.

[33] *OGIS* 54 lines 11–14.

[34] Cf. Desanges 1970, 31–50.

six hundred miles south of Aswan[35]—the logistical problems involved in gaining access to them, and the difficulties involved in transporting them to Egypt by the Nile with its numerous rapids combined to mean that the main focus of Ptolemaic elephant hunting would be the Red Sea region despite the smaller size of the herds in its hinterlands and the difficulties and expense involved in developing the infrastructure required to exploit that route.

Despite its logistical challenges and high costs, Ptolemy II began elephant hunting via the Red Sea almost immediately after the end of the First Syrian War. His first step was the foundation, probably about 270 BC, of the port of Philotera,[36] about seventy miles south of the entrance to the Gulf of Suez, to serve as a base for hunting elephants. The foundation of Philotera was quickly followed by that of Ptolemais of the Hunts, further south near the present day port of Aqiq on the coast of the central Sudan. According to the account in the Pithom Stele, Ptolemais of the Hunts was intended to be a self-supporting base from which elephant hunting expeditions could be dispatched into the interior, and captured elephants could be transported to Memphis for training by way of the Red Sea and the old Nile canal,[37] which originally had been built by Darius I in the late sixth century BC and reopened by Ptolemy II during the late 270s BC:[38]

> He built a great city to the king with the illustrious name of the king, the lord of Egypt, Ptolemy. And he took possession of it with the soldiers of His Majesty and all the officials of Egypt and the land of …; he made there fields and cultivated them with ploughs and cattle; no such thing took place there from the beginning. He caught elephants in great number for the king, and he brought them as marvels to the king, on his transports on the sea. He brought them also on the Eastern Canal; no such thing had ever been done by any of the whole earth.

Ptolemais of the Hunts remained the principal center of Ptolemaic elephant hunting throughout Ptolemy II's reign and thereafter. Important changes in how the hunts were conducted occurred soon after its foundation, however, which required significant additional expenditures by

[35] Bion, *FGrHist* 668F5 = Pliny *NH* 6.180.
[36] Strabo 16.4.5 (C769).
[37] Redmount 1995.
[38] English translation: Naville 1902–1903, 21 lines 23–24. For a recent German translation see Roeder 1959, 125–126. Cf. Bernand 1972, 9 *bis*, for the graffito of a carpenter named Dorion who accompanied Eumedes, the founder of Ptolemais of the Hunts.

Ptolemy II and his successors. Probably because of adverse sailing conditions in the northern Red Sea—strong prevailing northerly winds make sailing difficult above 20 degrees north latitude for most of the year[39]—the Nile canal was abandoned as the main route for transporting captured elephants from the Red Sea to Memphis, where the training facilities were maintained. As a result, a new Red Sea port had to built at Berenike near Ras Banas about two hundred miles east of Syene together with a road linking Berenike to Coptus on the Nile.[40] Even so, the challenges of conducting the hunts remained formidable.

The hunting expeditions—sometimes numbering hundreds of men[41]—had to be paid and supplied from Egypt as did the crews of the elephant transports that brought captured elephants to Berenike. Facilities had to be prepared near Thebes to house and feed the captured elephants after the long sea voyage and the desert march from Berenike before they could be transported downriver to Memphis for training. Liturgies also had to be instituted to provide men and grain to care for the animals, while they were at Thebes.[42] Moreover, the same peculiarities of the sailing regime in the Red Sea that led to the construction of Berenike also meant that shipyards had to be established there to maintain and repair the elephant transports because those in the Nile valley could no longer be used.[43] While ivory collected from elephants killed during the hunts may have offset some of these costs, ivory collecting also led to over-hunting of the small elephant herds near the coast, forcing Ptolemy II's successors constantly to seek new hunting grounds and to establish additional hunting stations south of Ptolemais of the Hunts, a process that finally resulted in extending the hunting zone outside the Red Sea itself, reaching the northern coast of Somalia some time in the reign of Ptolemy IV.[44]

---

[39] Préaux 1952, 271.

[40] On Berenike see now Sidebotham and Wendrich 1995–2000. For an overview of the road system connecting Berenike to the Nile see Sidebotham and Zitterkopf 1995, 39–52.

[41] A papyrus letter of 223 BC refers to a hunting expedition numbering 231 men (*FHN* no. 121 = *P.Eleph.* 28).

[42] *P.Hibeh* 110, lines 78–79; cf. Rostowzew 1913, 181.

[43] *FHN* no. 120 mentions the preparation of a new elephant transport at Berenike after one had sunk in the Red Sea. For the dangers of sailing in the Red Sea see the vivid account of Agatharchides, *On the Erythraean Sea* F85a–b (Burstein) and the dedications to Pan at the temple of Pan Euodos at El-Kanaïs by those 'saved from the Trogodytes' (Bernand 1972, 13, 18, 42, 44, 47; Householder and Prakken 1945).

[44] Cf. Burstein 1996, 799–807.

Not since the Egyptian New Kingdom, over a millennium earlier, had Egyptian military forces operated in Nubia on such a scale and with such freedom. Despite recognition of Ptolemaic suzerainty by Kush, Egyptian activity on this scale inevitably provoked resistance from the peoples of the region. According to Strabo, Eumedes, the founder of Ptolemais of the Hunts, already faced local opposition at the time of the foundation of the town; which, however, he overcame by secretly fortifying "the peninsula with a ditch and stockade; then he conciliated the people who were seeking to obstruct him and made them friends instead of enemies."[45] The peoples involved were probably Trogodytes, warlike pastoralists who inhabited the Red Sea hills behind Ptolemais of the Hunts. Papyrological evidence for Trogodyte translators points to continued efforts to maintain good relations with Trogodyte groups.[46] Sometimes, of course, diplomacy failed to overcome resistance, as Agatharchides reports,[47] noting how elephant hunting populations west of the Red Sea rebuffed Ptolemaic agents' efforts to persuade them to help capture elephants alive instead of hunting them for food as was their custom. An unsuccessful effort by a traditionalist Kushite faction to break free of Ptolemaic influence is probably also behind Agatharchides' dramatic story of a failed coup against the philhellenic king of Kush Ergamenes/Arqamani-qo (ca. 270–260 BC) because of his cooperation with Ptolemy II's plans in Nubia:[48]

> The strangest of all their customs, however, is that concerning the death of their kings. In Meroe, whenever it enters the mind of the priests, who care for the worship and honors of the gods and occupy the highest and most exalted status, they send a messenger to the king ordering him to die. (2) They say that the gods have revealed this to them, and that the order of the immortals must not be disregarded in any way by those of mortal nature. They also assert other things such as would be accepted by a nature of limited intelligence that has been raised in accordance with customs that are ancient and difficult to eradicate and does not possess arguments with which to oppose arbitrary commands. (3) In earlier times, therefore, the kings obeyed the priests, not having been conquered by weapons or force but their reason having been overcome by this superstition. During the reign of the second Ptolemy, however, Ergamenes, the king of the Aithiopians, who had received a

[45] Strabo 16.4.7 (C770).
[46] *PP* 6.16220.
[47] Agatharchides *On the Erythraean Sea* F57 (Burstein).
[48] As preserved by Diodorus 3.6; cf. Török 1992, 555–561 for his philhellenism. Date: Welsby 1996, 208.

> Greek education and understood philosophy, first dared to spurn this practice. (4) He made a decision that was worthy of his royal rank and entered accompanied by some soldiers the shrine where is located the gold temple of the Aithiopians, and killed all the priests. After abolishing this custom, he reorganized affairs in accordance with his own plans.

Ptolemy II pursued his elephant hunting project throughout his reign, and the Adulis inscription indicates that by the time of his death in 246 BC he had achieved his primary goal of building a battle worthy elephant corps and training new mahouts. The evidence concerning the size of his elephant corps is ambiguous. St. Jerome, following the third century AD scholar Porphyry,[49] claims that Ptolemy II possessed 400 elephants, while the second century AD historian Appian,[50] citing records preserved at Alexandria, puts the size of his herd at 300 animals. Hunting on a scale necessary to produce a herd of this size is, however, unlikely, and there is no evidence that Ptolemy II successfully bred elephants in captivity. Hellenistic sources, moreover, suggest a lower figure. So, Callixeinus[51] claims that there were twenty-four elephant-drawn quadrigas in Ptolemy II's great procession which implies that he possessed at least ninety-six trained elephants at some point in his reign, while in 217 BC Ptolemy IV deployed seventy-three elephants against Antiochus III's 102 elephants at the Battle of Raphia.[52] As Ptolemy IV mobilized all available forces including Egyptian heavy infantry for the Battle of Raphia, it is likely that the seventy-three elephants that fought at Raphia were all that he had, suggesting that the size of the Ptolemaic elephant corps ranged between about 70 and 100 animals during the third century BC. Its performance was, however, mixed, apparently performing well during Ptolemy III's invasion of Syria in 245 BC at the beginning of the Third Syrian War, but unsuccessfully at the Battle of Raphia where Ptolemy IV's outnumbered African forest elephants could not cope with Antiochus III's larger and stronger Indian elephants.[53]

Despite the poor performance of the Ptolemaic elephant corps at the Battle of Raphia, elephant hunting not only continued but it did so on an expanded scale throughout the reign of Ptolemy IV. Events,

---

[49] *Apud* Porphyry, *FGrHist* 260F42.
[50] Appian *Preface* 10.
[51] Callixeinus *FGrHist* 627F2.32 with Rice 1983, 92–93.
[52] Polybius 5.79.2, 82.7.
[53] Polybius 5.84.3–7. Gowers (1948, 173–180) pointed out that the Ptolemies used the smaller forest elephants and not the large African bush elephants.

however, conspired to end the hunts in the last decade of the third century BC, almost three quarters of a century after Ptolemy II began them. For over two decades from 207 BC to 186 BC the Ptolemaic government was forced to focus all its efforts on regaining control of Upper Egypt from Egyptian rebels supported by the kingdom of Kush. Kush also took advantage of the Egyptian revolt to throw off Ptolemaic suzerainty and to successfully reassert its authority in lower Nubia,[54] even managing to occupy Philae,[55] which it held until the forces of Ptolemy V decisively defeated the rebels and their Kushite allies in a battle near Thebes in 186 BC.[56] A generation later Ptolemy VI may have attempted to resume an active policy in Nubia, founding two military colonies near the second cataract of the Nile,[57] demanding tribute from Kush,[58] and possibly even resuming elephant hunting,[59] but his death in 145 BC aborted his program and put an end to any hope of restoring Ptolemaic power in Nubia. During the remainder of the Ptolemaic period most of the ports and other facilities that had supported the hunts were gradually abandoned so that by the first century AD few traces remained of Ptolemy II's ambitious project.

In scale, complexity, and extent, Ptolemy II's elephant hunting initiative was a remarkable undertaking, perhaps the largest and most complex project ever undertaken by the Ptolemies. Although the successful conduct of the elephant hunts was a notable achievement, they and the foreign policy that supported them had only limited success. While the Ptolemies did succeed in building an elephant corps, it failed in its biggest challenge at the Battle of Raphia and almost brought about the defeat of the Egyptian army. Likewise, while Ptolemy II and his immediate successors managed to secure Egypt's southern frontier and access to gold, ivory and other Nubian products besides elephants, it is not clear if these resources offset the high costs of the program. More seriously, the Ptolemies' heavy handed policy toward Kush only fueled Kushite resentment, leading to their intervention in the great Egyptian revolt that cost the Ptolemies control of Upper Egypt for over two

[54] Winter 1981, 509–513; Kormysheva 1997, 353–355; and Veïsse 2004, 85–95.
[55] The Kushite king Adikhalamani set up a stela on Philae (*FHN* no. 132).
[56] *FHN* no. 134.
[57] *OGIS* 111; cf. Heinen 1997.
[58] *FHN* no. 137 = Junker 1958, 263–277.
[59] Ptolemy VI's army included elephants during his Syrian campaign (Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 13.4; cf. Scullard 1974, 188–189).

decades. Culturally, however, the results of Ptolemy II's Nubian initiative were long-lasting and significant.

Strabo[60] mistakenly claimed that Ptolemy II's interest in science was behind his exploration of Nubia, but the reports Ptolemaic explorers and hunters prepared did revolutionize Greek knowledge of the geography and ethnography of the interior of northeast Africa, providing geographers and historians with information about the region that would not be equaled in extent and quality until the compilation of the medieval Arabic accounts of Nubia.[61] Thanks to them, the centuries-old puzzle of the cause of the Nile flood was solved, and rumors may even have reached them of the Nile's ultimate source in Lake Victoria in modern Uganda.[62] Its impact on Kush was also significant. Kushites not only imported Greek luxury goods including drinking vessels and amphorae and even masons to work on their temples, but they also even adopted the use of war elephants.[63] More important, however, Ergamenes/Arqamani-qo's reforms fundamentally changed the character of the Kushite monarchy, giving it the form it retained until the kingdom of Kush itself disappeared in the mid-fourth century AD, but that is another story.

[60] Strabo 17.1.5 (C789).
[61] Burstein 2000.
[62] Huss 'Die Quellen des Nils'.
[63] Agatharchides *On the Erythraean Sea* 8 n. 1.

PIETY AND DIPLOMACY IN APOLLONIUS' *ARGONAUTICA*

Anatole Mori

The contrast between the diplomatic Alcinous and the tyrannical Aietes is pronounced in the *Argonautica*, but little scholarly attention has been paid to the question of whether and in what ways (if the answer is positive) the Ptolemaic conflation of religious and political authority is inscribed in the ethical polarization of leaders in this poem. The Ptolemaic synthesis of piety and diplomacy is certainly suggested by the poem's representation of royal cult activity: Alcinous and the other monarchs who aid the Argonauts are associated with public sacrifices and in addition are shown to prefer mediation to aggression, to honor sworn agreements, and to respect the mandates of "straight justice."[1] Those kings and tribes who are suspicious of the Argonauts, on the other hand, are relatively dissociated from sacrifice and are likely to be violent and unstable in their allegiances.[2] The following argument will accordingly seek the connections between the image of benevolent kings in the *Argonautica* and Philadelphus' poetic self-representation, beginning first with a consideration of several issues that are fundamental for interpretation of the poem, namely, its date and relevance of the poem for the ideological program of the Ptolemies.

Apollonius is said to have lived in the time of Ptolemy III Euergetes (284–221) by several ancient sources: a brief passage from a second-century C.E. Oxyrhynchus papyrus, an entry in the Byzantine *Suda*,

[1] Examples of royal sacrifice by diplomatic kings include Hypsipyle (1.858–860), Cyzicus (1.966–967), Lycus (2.760–761), Alcinous (4.994–995), all of whom welcome the Argonauts with feasts, as does Phineus at 2.302–303 (though in this instance the Argonauts have provided their own sheep).

[2] When the Argonauts encounter Amycus, the Bebrycian king, they are met with a pugilistic challenge rather than hospitality (2.11–18); in the Brygeian islands Jason suspects the Hylleans of plotting against them (4.404–407: see Green 1997, p. 314, n. 526), and indeed after Apsyrtus' murder they abandon their Colchian sympathies and help the Argonauts (4.526–528); later the Argonauts manage to avoid the unfriendly Celts and Ligurians with Hera's aid (4.645–648). On Aietes' "welcome" feast for the sons of Phrixus, see further below.

and two biographical notes (possibly late first-century B.C.E.). These sources report that Apollonius went into exile in Rhodes because the first edition (*proekdosis*) of the *Argonautica* was badly received. Scholars continue to be divided regarding the veracity of this story,[3] but most now agree that Apollonius probably served as Euergetes' tutor, an honorific office held in association with the post of Chief Librarian, during the reign of Philadelphus. Apollonius probably composed the *Argonautica* between 270 and 260, revising it several times during Philadelphus' rule,[4] a period when the court poets Callimachus and Theocritus were also active. Yet while their works openly celebrate the Ptolemies in their encomiastic works, the *Argonautica* does not, presumably because the narrative is set in the generation before the Trojan War. Even so, the narrator frequently employs aetiological references and digressions to anticipate the future of the ancient sites and cultural practices that are mentioned, and it is likely that the entire poem was designed, as Stephens (2003, 173) has recently put it, to provide a "mythic historicity" for the Greco-Macedonian inhabitants of the recently founded Alexandria.

As a scholarly trend, connecting the *Argonautica* with the particulars of Ptolemaic Egypt is not especially new: it has been nearly forty years since Fränkel (1968, 514) observed that the narrator's aetiological reference to the future cult of the Dioscuri (4.650–653) could be seen as an epic precedent for the cult of living rulers. Still, recent studies of the poem continue to be primarily concerned with the poem's ties to other poetic works, from Homeric epic to Attic tragedy and contemporary poetry, and thus do not consider, for the most part, the implications of its larger political context.[5] We should not be surprised, however, to find such associations in the *Argonautica*, given the practical dependence of Alexandrian scholar-poets on Ptolemaic patronage and the allusive character of Alexandrian poetry as a whole. For that matter,

[3] For arguments against the exile and alleged quarrel with Callimachus, see Lefkowitz 1980, 1981 and 2001, Rengakos 1992, and Hunter 1989; Green 1997 and Cameron 1995 argue in support.

[4] Hunter 1989, 1–9. This estimate is earlier than the previous estimate of 250–240 made by Vian (2002/1974, xiii). Vian posits Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, written after 246, as contemporary with a revised version of the *Argonautica*, but Hunter (1989, 7–8) suggests that similarities may be the result of earlier versions of the hymn, which were likely to have circulated in the Library.

[5] See, e.g., Byre 2002; Clare 2002; Albis 1996; Knight 1995, Clauss 1993; Goldhill 1991, 284–333; Hutchinson 1988, 85–142; Beye 1982. Cf. Barnes 2003, Stephens 2003, Mori 2001, Pietsch 1999, Hunter 1995 and 1993, Rostropowicz 1983, and Huxley 1980.

the adventures of the Argonauts in distant regions like the Black Sea and northern Africa attest a programmatic interest in expanding both the topographical and the topical boundaries of epic in accordance with the Greco-Macedonian diaspora of the fourth and third centuries. Thus, it is likely that the *Argonautica*, like other works produced in Alexandria at this time, is concerned with the construction of political authority, even if the epic idiom remains allusive and analogical rather than explicit and denotative. We may therefore justifiably consider whether the characterization of Alcinous and Aietes reflects what we know of Philadelphus' poetic self-representation, and if so, in what ways it does. In this way we may perhaps add a new dimension to our understanding of Philadelphus' public characterization as a pious and diplomatic ruler.

Let us begin by taking a look at Ptolemy's religious responsibilities. In keeping with Egyptian (and for that matter, Argead) tradition, Ptolemy served as an intermediary between gods and mortals. For the ancient Egyptians, kingship entailed both a living being and a divine office.[6] This exact formulation—mortal being, divine office—may have been somewhat unfamiliar to the new Macedonian rulers, but they quickly put it to use. The Egyptian king was traditionally understood to be the son of the sun god Re and the image of Ammon. For the sake of a newly arrived Greek audience, the king was likewise assimilated to specific Greek gods like Helios, Zeus, and Dionysus, just as the queen was assimilated to Aphrodite, Isis, and Agatha Tychē, "Good Fortune".[7]

Though this identification of the royal couple with gods was clearly Egyptian in origin, "…the basic thought pattern was not foreign to the Greeks", as Koenen (1993, 70) observes. In Callimachus' affirmation that there is nothing on earth more godly (*theioteron*) than the lords of Zeus (*Hymn* 1.80) we hear echoes of Hesiod, who proclaimed Zeus the father of kings (ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες, *Th.* 96). But while all kings were thought to be allied with Zeus *ex officio*, it was not the case that all kings were equally favored by the gods (Call. *Hymn* 1.84–86 Pfeiffer):

> ἐν δὲ ῥυηφενίην ἔβαλές σφισιν, ἐν δ' ἅλις ὄλβον·
> πᾶσι μέν, οὐ μάλα δ' ἶσον. ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι
> ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι· περιπρὸ γὰρ εὖρυ βέβηκεν.

[6] Silverman 1991, 67.
[7] Stephens 2003, 20–21.

> [Zeus] poured riches upon them,
> And prosperity enough. On all, but not
> The same amounts. We can infer as much
> From our lord's case, for he outstrips them all
> By far.[8]

It is Ptolemy's exceptional piety that wins greater favor from Zeus, and thus it is Ptolemy's role as the sponsor rather than the recipient of cult that primarily interests us here.

In effect, the royal office brought with it not only divine antecedents but also an attendant responsibility to sacrifice on behalf of the entire country. As a divine intermediary, it was the Egyptian king's duty to perform sacrifices that would maintain good relations with the gods and therefore increase the prosperity of his realm. Philadelphus' sacred responsibilities are described in Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, an encomium that praises his respect for the honors owed to his divine parents (17.121–127 Gow):

> Μοῦνος ὅδε προτέρων τε καὶ ὧν ἔτι θερμὰ κονία
> στειβομένα καθύπερθε ποδῶν ἐκμάσσεται ἴχνη,
> ματρὶ φίλᾳ καὶ πατρὶ θυώδεας εἵσατο ναούς
> ἐν δ'αὐτοὺς χρυσῷ περικαλλέας ἠδ'ἐλέφαντι
> ἵδρυται πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀρωγούς.
> Πολλὰ δὲ πιανθέντα βοῶν ὄγε μηρία καίει
> μησὶ περιπλομένοισιν ἐρευθομένων ἐπὶ βωμῶν
>
> This man, alone of men of the past and of those whose still
> Warm footprints mark the trodden dust, has established fragrant
> Shrines to his loving mother and father; within, he has set them
> Glorious in gold and ivory to bring aid to all upon the earth.
> Many are the fattened thighs of cattle that he burns upon the
> Bloodied altars as the passage of months proceeds…[9]

By sponsoring countless sacrifices, in this case to the deified Soter and Berenice I, Philadelphus is said to bring aid not just to the inhabitants of Egypt but, interestingly, to all humanity. Philadelphus' sphere of influence is therefore portrayed, at least, as Zeus-like in its universality and its regard for the well-being of all peoples, not just his own.

At the same time, however, Philadelphus was also celebrated as a military hero. He was not especially active on the battlefield: riding into battle seldom, if at all, in contrast to the ideal warrior-king exem-

[8] Tr. Nisetich 2001, 23, 111–115.
[9] Tr. Hunter 2003, 89.

plified by his father Ptolemy I Soter.[10] On the Satrap Stele (dated to 311), Soter is celebrated for his prowess in battle, his matchless skill with the bow and the sword, and for recovering former Egyptian territory and religious artefacts from the Persians (Cairo CG 22182; Sethe 1904–1916, 1:13–16). Egypt was not precisely "spear-won" since the Persians had originally ceded it to Alexander without a battle, but the image is not unrealistic inasmuch as Soter had previously campaigned with Alexander the Great, had successfully defended Egypt against invasions (although it must be admitted that adverse weather and terrain were decisive factors in these victories), and was engaged in a prolonged struggle for control of Syrian territory. Be that as it may, Soter generally played the role of an onlooker in the wars of the Successors,[11] and Philadelphus seems to have adopted a similar approach. He continued to campaign in Syria, celebrating his triumphs, like his father, by erecting an official monument, the Pithom Stele (in 264; Cairo CG 22183, Sethe 1904–1916, 2:81–104), which praises the Ptolemaic recovery of formerly Egyptian possessions. Inasmuch as he in fact won control of Samos and Syria in the first Syrian war (274–271), such praise was not inappropriate (although this territory was later lost in the second Syrian war, from 260 to 53).[12] In any case it is important to note that Ptolemaic military activity in Syria was publicly justified, by Soter as well as Philadelphus, as the recovery of territory that rightfully belonged to Egypt.

Thus, despite his successes, Philadelphus appears to have fallen somewhat short of his father's mark.[13] The martial images that occasionally crop up in the poetic encomia dedicated to Philadelphus are limited in number. Theocritus praises the king in military terms in *Idyll* 17, observing that Berenice bore the king as "a warrior son to a warrior."[14] Later in the poem Theocritus also describes him as "skilful in

[10] Cf. Samuel 1993, 183, who considers the view that Philadelphus "was unmilitary and pacific in character" incorrect, citing his incessant involvement in war for the first three decades of his rule. At issue, however, is Philadelphus' physical presence on the field of battle, not his ability to deploy troops at a comfortable distance.

[11] Shipley 2000, 201–202.

[12] Philadelphus also supported what turned out to be an unsuccessful Athenian and Spartan alliance against Antigonus Gonatas in the Chremonidean War (267–60). *IG* II^2 686 + 687. See Habicht 1997, 142–145.

[13] Hazzard 2000, 38–39.

[14] *Id*. 17.56–57 Gow: σὲ δ', αἰχμητὰ Πτολεμαῖε, αἰχμητᾷ Πτολεμαίῳ ἀρίζηλος Βερενίκα.

wielding the spear."[15] The phrase alludes to Achilles, who is said to be unique among the Achaeans in his skill at wielding both his own spear and that of Peleus.[16] Though the reference to Achilles flatters the king, at least with respect to his knowledge of Homer, the description remains essentially generic, and relies on poetic camouflage to divert attention from a lack of specific instances of the king's martial prowess. And so, as one might perhaps expect, the poem compensates by celebrating Philadelphus' heroic ancestors, the troops who surround him, the strength of the country's defences, his piety, and the wealth and extent of his dominion. In Theocritus' *Idyll* 14 we find a plausible approximation of Philadelphus' personality: "considerate, fond of the arts, amorous, and utterly pleasant" (14.61). From his coin portraits he appears to have been somewhat overweight,[17] and was said to follow intellectual pursuits because of physical weakness, either congenital or the result of illness (Strabo 17.1.5, Ael. *VH* 4.15), though in truth there is little evidence to suggest that he suffered chronic illness apart from painful attacks of gout. These would presumably have subsided after five to ten days, and evidently did not prevent him from traveling, since he was known to participate in Nubian and Ethiopian elephant hunts.[18]

All things considered, Philadelphus' true talents appear to have been less martial than managerial with respect to both the domestic economy and international relations. Indeed, a significant component of his public image lay in the area of international mediation. The ancient Greeks had long relied on arbitration in the resolution of conflict,[19] but the practice of intervention by third-party mediators had become much more widespread in the Hellenistic period, probably as a result of increasing refinements in diplomatic protocol.[20] Interstate arbitration on mainland Greece, the islands, and in western Asia Minor gen-

---

[15] *Id.* 17.103 Gow: ἐπιστάμενος δόρυ πάλλειν.

[16] *Il.* 16.141–144: Patroclus arms himself with two spears, but not that of Achilles, which he alone could wield. The same lines are repeated when Achilles arms himself with the spear of his own father at 19.388–391. For discussion, see Hunter 2003, 176–177.

[17] E.g., a gold octadrachm dated to 246, now in the British Museum, that depicts Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II (reproduced in Green 1990, 145, fig. 57).

[18] On the probable causes, symptoms, and severity of Philadelphus' gout, see Tunny 2001. For Philadelphus' elephant hunting see the Adoulis Inscription (*OGIS* 54 = Bagnall and Derow 2004/1981 no. 26) and Stanley Burstein's article in this volume.

[19] See Gagarin 1986, 19–50 on dispute-settlements in early Greek literature.

[20] Ager (1996, xiii) attributes the rise in third-party intervention to the increasing refinement in diplomatic protocol.

erally addressed debt, property disputes, or loan and contract settlements, with teams of dicasts or individual judges invited from one city to another, often to handle an overload of cases. More importantly, Hellenistic kings themselves would take part in the mediation of international disputes. Appian records that in 252 Philadelphus offered to mediate between Carthage and Rome in the First Punic War. Claiming friendship with both states,[21] he refused to lend 2,000 talents to the Carthaginians, who would have used the money to strengthen their military forces.[22] Philadelphus was undoubtedly motivated by thrift rather than pacifism, and in this way he avoided being drawn into a costly war. In addition, as a mediator he was able to take an active part in the conflict without sacrificing the security of a politically neutral position.

Although Philadelphus' mediation between Rome and Carthage occurred toward the end of his reign, it is apparent that he appreciated the political value of pious displays from the beginning. The Nikouria decree was passed ca. 280 by the League of Islanders, an organization that represented the political interests of the Cycladic islands of the southern Aegean. The League responded favorably to Philadelphus' request for recognition of a new festival, the Ptolemaieia, as the political equivalent of the Olympian Games.[23] The members based their decision in large part on Philadelphus' continuing friendship with them and his laudable desire to honor his divine ancestors. As a result of the decree, participating cities would sponsor the attendance of sacred envoys from all over the Mediterranean and would also finance a golden wreath to honor Philadelphus himself. The festival thus allowed Philadelphus not only to celebrate the gods of Egypt and the royal dynasty but also to promote international goodwill with the island cities. While the League had been under Ptolemaic influence since approximately 286,[24] the particulars of the decree demonstrate the interrelation of Ptolemaic cult and politics: indeed, the nature of the monarchy rendered the two inseparable.

---

[21] Philadelphus' diplomatic foreign policy continued under Ptolemy IV Philopator, who attempted to resolve differences between Carthage and Rome during the Second Punic War. He also successfully resolved the Social War in Greece in 217. For discussion of relations between Egypt and Rome in the third century, see Gruen 1984, 673–678.

[22] *Sikelika* 1; Ager 1996, 109–110 (no. 35).

[23] *IG* XII 7.506 (= *SIG*^{3} 390).

[24] On the organization of the league and its relation to the Ptolemies, see Bagnall 1976, 136–141. See also Price 1984, 28–29 on Ptolemaic influence over subject states.

The first Alexandrian Ptolemaieia featured a fantastic procession (*pompē*) that has been described by Callixenus.[25] We need not rehearse the extremes of the *pompē* here, other than to observe that it literally paraded the king's wealth and military strength before an international audience that included visiting dignitaries and other guests of political importance.[26] Thousand marched in costume as Satyrs, Sileni, and maenads accompanied by countless exotic animals and carts loaded with wine and images of Dionysus: the cost was estimated at over 2000 talents. Callixenus notes that it concluded with a procession of 23,000 cavalry troops and 57,600 foot soldiers, all of whom were marvelously outfitted. Philadelphus himself may not have ridden at the head of the line, but his power was no less apparent.

The poetic and historical evidence we have considered shows the interrelation of the king's cult activity with his image as a pious and just mediator, backed by a powerful army and an especially powerful navy. In reality, of course, Philadelphus seems to have found it necessary to defend his position with a prejudicial vengeance worthy of Alexander, for he evidently eliminated one or more of his half-brothers (Paus. 1.7.1), not to mention Demetrius of Phalerum, who had advised Soter against Philadelphus' succession (Diog. Laert. 5.78–79). Nevertheless, Ptolemy's public image was that of a pious and beneficent diplomat, a model thoroughly in keeping with Apollonius' idealized portrait of the Phaeacian king Alcinous.[27]

At least one critic (Rostropowicz 1983) has also argued for the existence of a similar parallel between Philadelphus and Jason.[28] Jason's characterization is more dynamic than that of Alcinous, and as a

[25] The date of the Ptolemaieia, the festival during which this procession took place, is not certain. Soter died in 283/2, and a generous estimate for the Ptolemaieia is at some point between 280 and 270. Hölbl 2001, 94 dates it to 279/8; Rice 1983, 5; 165, who suggests that 280–275 is likely; additional bibliography is cited in Hunter 2003, 2 n. 6. Callixenus composed the surviving account of the procession (*pompē*) by consulting state records more than one hundred years after the event. His description has subsequently come down to us in the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus (Athen. 197–203), dating from the second to third century CE

[26] Hazzard 2000, 69–74.

[27] For the nest of associations between Philadelphus and Alcinous, see Hunter 1995, 22–25; 1993, 161–162. On generosity, justice, and mildness of temper as political virtues that are associated with the idealized Hellenistic king, see Aalders 1975, 21.

[28] Rostropowicz 1983, 61 argues that Philadelphus is a model for Jason's diplomatic character, as well as his charitable aid to characters in need, such as Phineus and Phrixus. The idealized portrait of the Hellenistic king as a defender of the weak can also be seen, she suggests, in Alcinous.

consequence certain of his actions, like the murder of Apsyrtus, render the comparison rather less flattering to the king. Still, Jason's duties are primarily diplomatic: we learn during the election at Pagasae that the leader (*orchamos*) of the Argonauts is to be responsible for handling quarrels and agreements with foreign leaders (1.338–340). In such circumstances Jason would presumably act as an advocate on behalf of the Argonauts rather than as an impartial arbiter, and yet the centrality of mediation (in contrast to heroic aggression) in the Argonautic representation of responsible leadership clearly aligns Jason—at least in this regard—with Alcinous and thus, by extension, with Ptolemy himself.

Moreover, Jason's formal contact with the divine both confirms and secures his leadership of the Argonauts. This proportional relation between Jason's hegemony and ritual practice is reinforced by the characterization of other authority figures, all of whom comprise an array of ethical modulations ranging from the fair and diplomatic to the arrogant and xenophobic. More precisely, the moral stance of rulers in the poem is typically correlated with the narrative duration and frequency of their ritual activity. While almost all leaders engage in sacrifice of one kind or another, the character and context of their sacrifices is evidently keyed to their respective political temperaments. The more arrogant a given ruler is, the more tenuous or problematic his ritual practice turns out to be (e.g., the savage Amycus performs no sacrifices, 2.1–97; Pelias sacrifices to the gods but fails to honor Hera, 1.14). Diplomatic kings, on the other hand, are consistently linked with extended descriptions of prayer and sacrifice. Such a correlation seems natural enough, but what is interesting is the way in which the specific details of such scenes vary in accordance with the exercise, just or unjust, of power.

Inasmuch as kings in the *Argonautica* offer cult but do not themselves receive it, they more closely resemble their Homeric counterparts than the Ptolemies, and they are, for the most part, portrayed as mortals, although there are several important exceptions. Aietes, the son of Helios, is a demi-god,[29] and Alcinous (like the rest of the Phaeacians) is traditionally thought to be close to divine (ἀγχίθεοι, *Od.* 5.35). But as

[29] Other signs of Aietes' divinity include the use of the term *mēnis* to describe his probable anger at Alcinous (4.1205). This term is typically reserved for instances of divine anger: the only other instances in the *Argonautica* are Cypris' anger at the Lemnians (1.802) and Zeus' anger at the Aeolids (3.337).

Virginia Knight (1995, 247) points out, Apollonius alters the Homeric description of Alcinous from θεοειδής (god-like, *Od.* 7.231) to θεουδής (god-fearing, *Arg.* 4.1123).[30] In Homeric epic the latter term appears in a formulaic expression that refers to the mores of unfamiliar peoples. Odysseus, for example, uses the term as he speculates about the Phaeacians, having just been awakened on the shore by the cries of Nausicaa and her handmaids (6.120–121): "Are they arrogant, savage, and unjust, or do they welcome strangers with god-fearing intent?"[31] In the *Argonautica*, by contrast, the philoxenic nature of the Phaeacians is apparent from the moment the Argonauts arrive (4.994–997 Vian):[32]

> Οἱ δ'ἀγανῇσιν
> Ἀλκίνοος λαοί τε θυηπολίῃσιν ἰόντας
> δειδέχατ'ἀσπασίως, ἐπὶ δέ σφισι καγχαλάασκε
> πᾶσα πόλις· φαίης κεν ἑοῖς ἐπὶ παισὶ γάνυσθαι.
>
> Alcinous and his people gladly welcomed their arrival with
> Propitiatory sacrifices, and the whole city celebrated:
> You would say they were exulting in their own children.

In contrast to the Homeric Phaeacians (whose response to Odysseus' arrival must be carefully managed by Alcinous and Arete as well as by Athena and Nausicaa), the Argonautic Phaeacians are shown to be pious and immediately hospitable, spontaneously joining in with the royal celebration. The narrator explains that they claim descent from the Titan Uranus (4.991–992), and have inherited a sacred island of ancient fertility.[33] Alcinous' prime attribute, his god-fearing (θεουδής) nature, is thus a distinguishing characteristic of all the Phaeacians. But because of Alcinous' position as king, this fearful respect plays a crucial role. As he explains to Arete, he is unable to protect Medea by forcing the Colchians to leave because he fears the "straight justice" (*dikēn itheian*) of Zeus (4.1100). Justice towards mortals (including foreigners) is synonymous with piety towards the gods: in effect, for Alcinous, to

---

[30] The two words differ in meaning, although θεουδής was evidently mistaken by later writers for θεοειδής: see B. Snell et al., Lexicon des frühriechischen Epos (Göttingen, 1979), s.v. θεουδής.

[31] 6.120–121 (= 9.175–176 = 13.201–202 ≅ 8.575–576): ἦ ῥ' οἵ γ' ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι /ἦε φιλόξεινοι, καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής;

[32] I have translated this and all other passages from the *Argonautica*.

[33] The narrator explains that the island is said to be sickle-shaped either because of its association with the instrument used by Cronus against Uranus (4.982–986) or because of its association with the reaping hook of chthonian Demeter (4.986–991).

be god-fearing is to be just. Thus, the motivation behind Alcinous' peaceful intervention in the quarrel between the Argonauts and the Colchians is thus the direct result of his pious regard for "straight justice." Alcinous' arbitration in this *neikos* is framed in idealistic terms, but it is also realistic insofar as it mirrors the practice of third-party mediation in international disputes.[34] Alcinous' arbitration therefore fits into the pattern of mediation by Hellenistic rulers and other diplomatic emissaries who sought to preserve *homonoia* (or at least to look like they were preserving it) all over the ancient Mediterranean world.

To appreciate the narrative significance of Alcinous' mediation in the Colchian *neikos*, we need to look more closely at an earlier arbitration in the poem. Alcinous is not, as it happens, the first king to arbitrate in the matter of Medea's status. We recall that the Argonauts had encountered the first half of the Colchian fleet in the Brygeian isles on the Illyrian coast. The Argonauts are outnumbered and quickly come to terms, rather unhomerically, rather than face defeat in battle (4.338–340). The Colchians agree to allow them to retain the Golden Fleece, since Jason did fulfill the labors stipulated by Aietes (4.341–344), but Medea's fate is still disputed by both sides (*amphēriston*, 4.345). The dispute is therefore left in the hands of one of the local "kings who uphold just precedents" (*themistouchōn basilēōn*, 4.347) while Medea is to be sequestered on a separate island in a sacred precinct of Artemis.

Unfortunately for Medea, the surrounding tribes are Colchian partisans, and as Jason points out, they are not only hostile (*dysmeneōn*, 4.397) but also eager to defend Apsyrtus.[35] It appears likely that any ruling of a royal arbiter selected by them would probably favor the Colchians and return Medea to Aietes. Medea berates Jason for abandoning her (4.376–378):

> Σχέτλιε, εἰ γὰρ κέν με κασιγνήτοιο δικάσσῃ
> ἔμμεναι οὗτος ἄναξ τῷ ἐπίσχετε τάσδ'ἀλεγεινὰς
> ἄμφω συνθεσίας, πῶς ἴξομαι ὄμματα πατρός;

[34] For evidence dealing with the intervention of kings, see Marshall 1980, 640 n. 47. See Ager 1996 on the largely epigraphic evidence for between 150 and 200 examples of arbitration or mediation in the two hundred and fifty years after Chaeronea. We have evidence for only about sixty cases of third-party mediation during the previous four centuries. See also Magnetto 1997 on mediation from 337 to 196, continuing the work of Piccirilli 1973, who collected instances down to 338.

[35] 4.399: Ἀψύρτῳ μεμάασιν ἀμυνέμεν.

> Cruel man, if he judges that I am to be with my brother,
> This king to whom the two of you[36] assign this hurtful treaty,
> How will I confront my father?

Medea's fear is tied to her powerlessness: this treaty (*synthesias*, 4.378) with the Colchians was made without her consent,[37] and she has no more influence over "this king" (*houtos anax*, 4.377), as she dismissively refers to him, than she does over Aietes. Of particular interest here is her concern regarding the trustworthiness of the *synthesia*. Medea will use the same term again in line 390, where she threatens that if she returns to Colchis the spirits of vengeance will ruin Jason's homecoming regardless of his faith in this agreement (*synthesiaōn*). He cannot use her to treat with the Colchians for safe passage, she reminds him, because he has already sworn a great oath by Olympian Zeus and Hera Zygiē (Of the Marriage Yoke) to marry her (4.95–96). Later, when the other half of the Colchian fleet catches up with the Argonauts on the Phaeacian island Drepane, Medea will use a similar argument to persuade the rest of the Argonauts, first begging them not to return her to her father, then threatening them with divine retribution if they betray her (4.1042–1044):

> Δείσατε συνθεσίας τε καὶ ὅρκια,[38] δείσατ'Ερινὺν
> Ἱκεσίην νέμεσίν τε θεῶν, εἰς χεῖρας ἰούσης
> Αἰήτεω λώβῃ πολυπήμονι δῃωθῆναι.
>
> Fear treaties and oaths, fear the Erinys
> Of suppliants and the vengeance of the gods, if into the hands
> Of Aietes I fall to perish in agony.

Medea's injunction regarding treaties (*synthesias*) and oaths (*horkia*) has a double meaning: such agreements are to be feared not only because Nemesis and the Furies will punish those who violate them, but also because they may be made covertly, to the disadvantage of others, and easily lend themselves to deception.

As a priestess of Hecate, Medea is familiar with the divine sanctions against oath-breaking, but past experience gives her no confidence in political negotiations. As she tells Jason at the temple of Hecate: "In Greece I suppose this is a fine thing, to honor agreements

[36] Jason and Apsyrtus.

[37] The narrator observes that Medea reckoned the situation in her own mind (4.350): τὰ ἕκαστα νόῳ πεμπάσσατο κούρη.

[38] In phrasing (if not sentiment) this line echoes Nestor's speech at *Iliad* 2.339: "What will become of our agreements and oaths?" (πῇ δὴ συνθεσίαι τε καὶ ὅρκια βήσεται ἤμιν;).

[*synēmosynas alegynein*],[39] but Aietes isn't disposed toward men the way you said Minos the husband of Pasiphae is." (3.1105–1107). Hera similarly describes Aietes as an arrogant (*hyperphialos*) king (3.15), a sentiment echoed by the Phaeacian queen Arete as she pleads with Alcinous on Medea's behalf (4.1083), and by Argus, the son of Phrixus, who warns the Argonauts that Aietes is "horribly armed with deadly cruelty."[40] These assessments of the king's character are borne out by his behavior, although it must be admitted that he is more sophisticated, or at least has a greater regard for appearances, given the power of the gods, than either Amycus or Pelias, the other kings in the poem.

When the sons of Phrixus introduce the Argonauts to Aietes, he initially attempts to camouflage his intentions with a semblance of civilized behavior.[41] He imagines that the sons of Phrixus have returned in order to seize his throne (3.576–605), and soon openly accuses them of uttering lies against the gods (3.381). Only his "respect for the rules of hospitality" prevents him, he says, from cutting off their tongues and hands (3.377–380). As Campbell observes, Aietes here demonstrates some respect for the laws of the gods,[42] yet it seems that this respect is little more than a pragmatic concession. Years ago he had received the suppliant Phrixus, although only because Zeus forced him to (3.587–588), and afterwards he sacrificed the ram of the Golden Fleece, somewhat grudgingly one imagines, to Zeus Phyxios (Patron of Fugitives). He now puts on a show of welcoming Phrixus' sons by Chalciope, Aietes' eldest daughter, whose attempt to return to Greece, the land of their father, has ended in shipwreck (3.270–274):

---

[39] The use of this particular term for a covenant or agreement (συνημοσύνη) suggests an agreement that is sanctioned by the gods or close kinship. It is somewhat uncommon, occurring when Jason tells his mother to have confidence in Athena's agreements (*Arg.* 1.300): θάρσει δὲ συνημοσύνῃσιν Ἀθήνης. Achilles also uses it when he refuses to treat with Hector regarding the terms of their duel (*Il.* 22.261): "Hector, don't go droning on and on about covenants, you wretch." (Ἕκτορ, μή μοι, ἄλαστε, συνημοσύνας ἀγόρευε).

[40] 2.1202–1203: "Ἀλλ' αἰνῶς ὀλοῇσιν ἀπηνείῃσιν ἄρηρεν / Αἰήτης…"

[41] Williams 1996, 465 points out that the Argonauts are themselves uncertain what to expect from Aietes, since they have received conflicting reports about his disposition earlier in the poem.

[42] Campbell 1994, p. 324 and 377f.: "We are reminded then in no uncertain terms that Aeetes does indeed, despite the vile talk issuing from his lips at this moment, have regard for the laws of hospitality…—not that he can bring himself to appeal to Zeus Xenios openly."

Τὸ δ' αὐτίκα πᾶν ὁμάδοιο
ἕρκος ἐπεπλήθει· τοὶ μὲν μέγαν ἀμφεπένοντο
ταῦρον ἅλις δμῶες, τοὶ δὲ ξύλα κάγκανα χαλκῷ
κόπτον, τοὶ δὲ λοετρὰ πυρὶ ζέον· οὐδέ τις ἦεν
ὃς καμάτου μεθίεσκεν ὑποδρήσσων βασιλῆι.

At once the whole courtyard
Was filled with people. Some of the servants attended to
A great bull, while others cut dry wood with a bronze axe
And heated water for bathing. There was no one
In service to the king who shirked his labor.

The description of the sacrifice recalls typical hospitality scenes in some respects: a hospitable welcome is being prepared. Yet on second thought there are interesting omissions in the narrative. A sacrifice is alluded to, but there is no actual reference to any god, no description of a ritual or prayer, and no mention of a feast. For that matter, it can hardly come as a surprise, given Aietes' angry reaction to Jason's request for the Golden Fleece, that the Argonauts are not invited (3.448). The narrator draws our attention only to the servants' concern to accomplish their duties without delay: what the scene illustrates is not the respect of the king for the gods, but the servants' fear of the king. Similarly, when Aietes speaks of his respect for the immortals, he is merely acknowledging their superior strength. Justice is one-sided for Aietes, who inhabits a Hobbesian world where the weak struggle in the shadow of the strong (3.420–421): "It is unseemly for a noble [*agathon*] man to yield to one low-born [*kakōterōi*]"—regardless, it is clear, of any agreements they may have made.[43] In the end, however, Aietes miscalculates his strength, for he will lose his daughter, his son, and the Colchian fleet as well. He has threatened them with death if they return without Medea (4.234–235), and after Apsyrtus' death both halves of the fleet elect remain in exile rather than return to Aietes empty-handed.[44]

Alcinous calls Aietes "most imperious" of kings (*basileuteros*, 4.1102), a term that alludes to Agamemnon's self-description in his failed attempt to win Achilles over (*Il.* 9.160): "Let him yield to me, for I am the more

[43] See also 3.437–438.

[44] Some of them settle on the Brygean isles of Artemis, others on the mainland, either near the tomb of Harmonia and Cadmus or in the mountains of Zeus the Thunderer (4.514–521), and still others among the Phaeacians and later the Amantes, the Nestaeans and the town of Oricum (4.1211–1216).

kingly."[45] While Aietes' Agamemnon-like 'kingliness' would likely suggest wrong-headed arrogance to a Greek audience, the kings of Colchis claimed him as an ancestor, much as Alexander claimed Achilles.[46] Aietes' entrance hall is certainly reminiscent of the sumptuous Persian palaces found by Alexander at Susa, Babylon, and Persepolis,[47] for the courtyard is filled with galleries and ringed with a bronze wall covered with flowering vines (3.217–237). Within the wall are four fountains, forged by the god Hephaestus, which flow with milk, wine, oil, and water, running hot and cold in conjunction with the trajectory of the Pleiades.[48] Aietes is thus a richly drawn character: both an Eastern potentate of divine heritage and a proud king in the tradition of Homeric chieftains, as the arming scene in which the narrator praises his helmet, shield, and spear indicates (3.1225–1234).[49] Yet despite these associations, he remains a flawed ruler. His contempt for scheming foreigners ironically leads him to break his own word, while his xenophobia leads him to condemn well-intentioned guests and to make enemies of his own family. In the complex political world of the *Argonautica*, the line between friend and foe is based on behavior rather than ethnic background, and the implication is that the 'kingliest' of kings, in a positive sense, will be the one who preserves the interests of all people upon the earth, not just his own.

Aietes is therefore the opposite of Alcinous, whose strength is rooted in the peaceful preservation of agreements. Like the royal arbiter in the Brygeian isles, Alcinous is called upon to resolve the Colchian *neikos* (4.1009–1010), but unlike his anonymous predecessor he succeeds to the satisfaction of all parties. He seeks, as he tells his wife, the queen Arete, a just solution that will seem best to everyone (*pasin anthrōpoisi*,

---

[45] For this reference I am indebted to the anonymous reader.

[46] According to Xenophon (*Anab.* 5.6.37), Colchian kings claimed descent from Aietes; the name was used at least until the sixth century. See Braund 1994, 37 n. 183.

[47] The Colchians were not exactly thought to be Persian, and this area of the Black Sea coast was settled by Greeks in the sixth century. Herodotus 3.97 observes that the Colchians, like the Ethiopians, were not taxed by Darius with tribute, but instead gave him gifts, and that the government was Persian as far north as the Caucasus mountains, though that was the limit of their sovereignty.

[48] This prodigy of nature suggests a parallel with the marvel of the spring flowing with water and oil encountered by Alexander en route to Sogdiana (Arr. 4.15.7–8). Clauss (1997, 156) notes that other parallels include the four fountains of Calypso's cave (*Od.* 5.68–73a) and the hot and cold sources of the Scamander River (*Il.* 22.148–152). See also Knight 1995, 227.

[49] See Williams 1996 who takes Aietes' part, arguing that in contrast to the thieving Argonauts the king behaves like an outraged Homeric warrior demanding justice.

4.1104–1105), and so he has determined that Medea's marital status will determine her fate. During the night before he announces this judgment publicly, a private wedding is arranged by Arete to ensure that as Jason's new wife Medea will not be sent home to her father. It seems that even among the Phaeacians *synthesiai* are deployed with strategic foresight, but the crucial difference between the Phaeacian and Brygeian negotiations lies in the result. The secret marriage on Drepane ensures that no one will be harmed, whereas the *dolos* of Jason and Medea leads to the killing not only of Apsyrtus but also of his ship's crew (4.485–489):

> Κόλχον δ' ὄλεκον στόλον, ἠύτε κίρκοι
> φῦλα πελειάων ἠὲ μέγα πῶυ λέοντες
> ἀγρότεροι κλονέουσιν ἐνὶ σταθμοῖσι θορόντες.
> Οὐδ' ἄρα τις κείνων θάνατον φύγε, πάντα δ' ὅμιλον
> πῦρ ἅ τε δηιόωντες ἐπέδραμον.
>
> …they preyed on the Colchian force like hawks
> On a flock of doves, or as wild lions
> Plunder a sheepfold, rushing among the great flock.
> Not one of those men escaped death: the whole crowd
> They overran, killing like fire.

In this scene we find the vicious fruits of Eros that are condemned by the narrator some lines above in an apostrophe to the cruel god (4.445–447).[50] In effect the slaughter of the Colchians is the unintended consequence of the Brygeian arbiter's failed negotiation, for his suspected partiality inspires no confidence among the Argonauts and therefore protects no one, whereas Alcinous' skillfully executed arbitration injures neither the Argonauts nor the surviving members of the Colchian fleet and for that matter preserves the security of the Phaeacians as well.

On the morning after the secret wedding Alcinous goes forth to reveal his decision "in accordance with their agreement" (*synthesiēsin*).[51] As Vian points out in his note on 4.1176, the narrator alluded to this agreement earlier in line 4.1010, where we learn of Alcinous' desire to resolve the *neikos* without bloodshed.[52] Moreover, we later find that Alcinous has taken care to "yoke" both the Colchians and the Argonauts to this agreement with "unbreakable oaths" (ἀρρήκτοισι

[50] Cf. the wolf in the sheepfold simile of the Argonauts' attack on the Bebrycians after the death of Amycus (2.123–129).

[51] 4.1175–1176: Ἀλκίνοος μετεβήσετο *συνθεσίῃσιν* / ὃν νόον ἐξερέων κούρης ὕπερ.

[52] 4.1010: λελίητο γὰρ ἀμφοτέροισι, / δηιοτῆτος ἄνευθεν ὑπέρβια νείκεα λῦσαι.

δ' ἐνιζεύξας ἔχεν ὅρκοις, 4.1205). They are yoked to their agreement much as Jason is yoked by his oath to Hera to marry Medea; such oaths are certainties to which the Colchians, from Aietes and Medea to Apsyrtus and the entire fleet, are unaccustomed. Alcinous, by contrast, applies treaties and oaths, like those with which Medea threatens the Argonauts (συνθεσίας τε καὶ ὅρκια, 4.1042), to lawful, peaceful ends. The "straight decrees" (*itheias themistas*, 4.1179; cf. 1207) delivered by the just king are quite different from those of Aietes, or the violent Amycus, whose own decree (*emas themistas*, 2.17) is simply that all foreigners must elect a champion to fight him to the death.[53] As Hunter has recently observed,[54] Alcinous' "straight decrees" anticipate a peaceful reconciliation like those of Hesiod's wise king, whose *themistes* are rooted in "straight judgment" (*Theog.* 84–87 West):[55]

> οἱ δέ τε λαοὶ
> πάντες ἐς αὐτὸν ὁρῶσι διακρίνουντα θέμιστας
> ἰθείῃσι δίκῃσιν· ὃ δ' ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύων
> αἶψά τε καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσεν.
>
> …All the people
> look to him as he makes decisions [*themistas*]
> with straight judgment [*itheiēisi dikēisin*]. He addresses the assembly steadfastly
> and quickly puts a stop to even a great conflict in his wisdom.

Alcinous similarly relies on the "straight judgment" (*dikēs itheiēs*) of Zeus, by using Medea's marital status, the "contested point" (*amphēriston*, 4.345), as the foundation of his decision.[56] That Jason and Medea's wedding took place only hours before makes no difference, then, since this does not violate the terms of the original agreement with the Colchians. Alcinous' steadfast adherence to this agreement is directly opposed to the "crooked judgment" (to use the Hesiodic idiom) of Aietes, who broke his own agreement regarding the Golden Fleece. As we observed earlier, the Colchians themselves recognize the Argonauts' claim on the fleece, regardless of whether they acquired it by trickery (*doloisin*, 4.343) or openly (*amphadiēn*, 4.344), because Aietes had already

---

[53] The truly lawless, like the Amazons, apparently do not even honor such rudimentary *themistes* as that of Amycus (2.987–988).

[54] Hunter 2004, 127.

[55] Clare 2002, 203–204; Vian 2002/1981, 3:120 n. 5.

[56] 4.1201–1202: Αὐτὰρ ὅ γ', ὡς τὰ πρῶτα *δίκης* ἀνὰ πείρατ' ἔειπεν / ἰθείης, ἤδη δὲ γάμου τέλος ἐκλήιστο.

agreed before his entire court to give it to them upon the completion of the labors in the field of Ares (4.341–344). "Straight justice" is a measure of the king's public integrity, not the methods, whether secret or open, by which others seek to anticipate or accommodate his rulings.

From a structural point of view, the centrality of piety in Alcinous' "straight justice" is reinforced by the order of events themselves, for the description of the communal sacrifice and celebration literally interrupts Alcinous' public declaration. On the morning of the pronouncement, the king arrives holding his staff of justice and flanked by Phaeacian warriors (4.1176–1181). The narrator then describes the arrival of crowds of women who come to see the heroes (4.1182–1183), as well as field labourers who have learned of the gathering through a rumour sent by Hera (4.1183–1185). Our attention is thereby drawn to the preparations for sacrifice and the public acknowledgement and celebration of Jason and Medea's midnight nuptials. This is a lengthy passage, but I will include it in order to clarify the elements of the scene (4.1185–1200):

Ἄγεν δ' ὁ μὲν ἔκκριτον ἄλλων
ἀρνειὸν μήλων, ὁ δ' ἀεργηλὴν ἔτι πόρτιν·
ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφιφορῆας ἐπισχεδὸν ἵστασαν οἴνου
κίρνασθαι· θυέων δ' ἀπὸ τηλόθι κήκιε λιγνύς.
Αἱ δὲ πολυκμήτους ἑανοὺς φέρον, οἷα γυναῖκες,
μείλιά τε χρυσοῖο καὶ ἀλλοίην ἐπὶ τοῖσιν
ἀγλαΐην, οἵην τε νεόζυγες ἐντύνονται.
Θάμβευν δ' εἰσορόωσαι ἀριπρεπέων ἡρώων
εἶδεα καὶ μορφάς, ἐν δέ σφισιν Οἰάγροιο
υἱὸν ὑπαὶ φόρμιγγος ἐυκρέκτου καὶ ἀοιδῆς
ταρφέα σιγαλόεντι πέδον κρούοντα πεδίλῳ.
Νύμφαι δ' ἄμμιγα πᾶσαι, ὅτε μνήσαιντο γάμοιο,
ἱμερόενθ' ὑμέναιον ἀνήπυον· ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
οἰόθεν οἷαι ἄειδον ἑλισσόμεναι περὶ κύκλον,
Ἥρη, σεῖο ἕκητι· σὺ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκας
Ἀρήτῃ πυκινὸν φάσθαι ἔπος Ἀλκινόοιο.

One led a ram, selected from the rest
Of his flock, another a heifer still untrained,
And others set up wine jars close by for mixing
While the sacrificial smoke billowed up in the distance.
The women brought robes of rich brocade, as they do,
And golden offerings, and other kinds of finery
Worn by those new to the marriage yoke.
They marveled as they looked at the beauty and form

> Of the matchless heroes, and among them Orpheus,
> The son of Oeagrus, tapping his ornate sandal
> In time to the tune of his well strung lyre.
> All the nymphs mingled their voices, the wedding in mind,
> Sweetly hymning a bridal melody, but at other times
> They sang unaccompanied, dancing around in a circle,
> To honor you, Hera, for it was your inspiration that led
> Arete to disclose the wise word of Alcinous.

The contrast with the sacrifice in Aietes' palace is apparent: here all the people take part of their own volition, out of curiosity and admiration. The just *themistes* of Alcinous are "decrees that favor the people" (*dēmoteras themistas*) that are encouraged by Dikē, the goddess of Judgment herself, as she is portrayed in Aratus' *Phaenomena*.[57] The passage is not so much a narrative as a tableau of ecphrastic or pictorial images: the preparations for sacrifice, the harvest of gifts for the married couple, the scene of choral singing and dancing—all these events are framed by the public assembly in a ring composition. As a result, the chronological sequence of events in this passage is very loosely defined: it is not clear whether the wedding celebration takes place before, during, or after Alcinous' declaration. Although the general chronology is uncertain, the ring composition (assembly—celebration—assembly) ensures that the communal sacrifice forms the dramatic heart of Alcinous' proclamation, which is neither quoted nor summarized again here. When the description of the assembly resumes after the apostrophe to Hera in line 1200, it reads like a denouement, especially since the judgment and its effects are only briefly summarized (4.1201–1210). In the aftermath of the secret nuptials and the public recognition of the wedding, Alcinous' decision seems unassailable, even anti-climactic, to the reader, not to mention to the Colchians, who quickly accept it (4.1206–1210). The structure of the scene forcefully demonstrates the strength of the Phaeacian king, whose just power is expressed in the strategic admixture of private diplomacy with pious celebration and a public display of military strength. The justice of the king can only be kept straight, in other words, through compromise and a broadly conceived respect for all concerned—the gods, the community, guests and foreign visitors alike.

It is helpful to compare the idealized Phaeacian tableau of assembly and celebration with the ecphrastic representation of the Homeric city

[57] Arat. *Phaen.* 107: *δημοτέρας* ἤειδεν ἐπισπέρχουσα *θέμιστας*.

at peace that is depicted on Achilles' shield (*Il.* 18.491–508). The peaceful city is characterized by scenes of a marriage procession, with women admiring the young men as they sing and dance, and by arbitration over a *neikos* (*Il.* 18.497) regarding the blood price of a homicide. Alcinous is the Argonautic equivalent of the Iliadic judge who will win two talents of gold for the "straightest judgment" (*dikēn ithuntata*, 18.508). Both these arbitrations emphasize the connection of the just rule of law with the fertility of the people; they are contrasted, moreover, with scenes of conflict, *neikea*, that end in death. The description of the city at war portrays a terrible ambush by the banks of a river (18.509–540): an apt comparison with the ambush of Apsyrtus and the Argonauts' subsequent slaughter of his crew.

What separates ambush from arbitration both for Homer and for Apollonius is the "straight justice" of Zeus, who strengthens *synthesiai*, *themistai*, and *horkia* with unbreakable bonds. But in the *Argonautica* Zeus' justice extends far beyond the walls of the peaceful Homeric city to honour all those who come from distant lands, the Argonauts and Colchians alike. The possibility that this is nothing more than ideologically charged artifice, the fanciful tale of a Golden Fleece whose brilliance is meant, like the gold of Philadelphus' grand procession, to dazzle the viewer, may not, perhaps, have been lost on Apollonius' original audience. It is tempting, moreover, to think that the poem is more critical than has previously been supposed, to see it as a cautionary tale that attributes, perhaps, something of Aietes' superficial concern for appearances to all kings, including Philadelphus, or at least warns against the corrosive threat that such tendencies pose to a just society. In any case it is clear that the poem's association of justice with peace-loving, *philoxenic* piety does not merely counter the combative heroism of traditional epic. Rather, it offers in its place a distillation of Ptolemaic ideology that is most evident in the contrast between Alcinous and Aietes. The episodes in which Aietes appears dramatize his untrustworthiness, his suspicious, belligerent, and autocratic character, the perfunctory nature of his piety, and his utter failure to cooperate with foreign guests or even to consider their requests in a reasonable fashion. By contrast, the episodes in which Alcinous appears reveal his interest in the wise counsel of his wife, his empathy for suppliants, fidelity to agreements, and respect for the gods, and in addition his reluctance to involve himself, his people, and his Greek allies in a costly war. In this way Alcinous embodies the ideals that are indeed associated with Philadelphus, who is publicly represented as a pious, just, and diplomatic ruler whose

military strength is cautiously deployed as a deterrent to aggression, as a means to recover only that which has always already belonged to Egypt.[58]

[58] I am very grateful for the comments of the audience and participants at the Ptolemy II conference, expecially Graham Zanker, Daniel Ogden, and Kostas Buraselis. I also owe a debt of thanks to the organizers of the conference, Paul McKechnie in particular, as well as to the anonymous reader for helpful suggestions and observations. Portions of this chapter appear in A. Mori, *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica* (Cambridge, 2008).

MARESHA IN THE REIGN OF PTOLEMY II PHILADELPHUS

Amos Kloner

During the third century BCE Maresha (Marissa) was under Ptolemaic rule and became the main city of Idumaea. It is mentioned in several of the Zenon papyri dated 259–257 BCE, shedding light on intensive commercial activities and trade between the city and Egypt (Edgar 1925–1931. P.*Cairo* 59006, 59015, 58537). Although there is ample evidence of third century BCE occupation at Maresha, the author has chosen to concentrate on only two areas: some economic-numismatic evidence and the tombs from the eastern necropolis presented below. The finds from Khirbet Za'aquqa reinforce this evidence and are also presented here.

The Economic Numismatic Evidence

Of the 950 coins found at Maresha, 135 are Ptolemaic. Of these, 116 coins date from between the time of Ptolemy I (305–283 BCE) and that of Ptolemy VIII (170–117 BCE). Of these, 78 coins were from the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (67.25 % of the total). Six of the 135 Ptolemaic coins are tetradrachms: three of Ptolemy II (one minted at Alexandria and two at Tyre); two of Ptolemy III (minted at Ioppe and Sidon); and one of Ptolemy VIII (most probably minted at Aradus). Two silver-plated tetradrachms of Ptolemy II were also found. These coins are clear evidence that in the third century BCE the local population of Maresha used Ptolemaic coins, about half of which were minted at Alexandria and the other half at Tyre. This may also indicate that almost all of their trade was conducted with Egypt and Egyptian-dominated lands.

Distribution of Ptolemaic coins found at Maresha:

Ruler	*No. of Coins*	*Percentage*
Ptolemy I Soter (305–283 BCE)	12	10.35%
Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE)	78	67.25%
Ptolemy II or III	4	3.45%
Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221 BCE)	16	13.80%
Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–205 BCE)	4	3.45%
Ptolemy V Epiphanes (205–180 BCE)	1	0.85%
Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (170–117 BCE)	1	0.85%

Although only two pre-Ptolemaic coins were found, there are historical and archaeological indications for an Idumaean settlement during the Persian period and the general impression from the excavations is of continuity from the Persian to the Ptolemaic period, especially indicated by finds from the Lower City. The total picture is of a settlement already begun under Ptolemy I, while according to the numismatic evidence as well as other finds from the excavation, the main *floruit* of the city was under Ptolemy II.[1]

The Evidence from the Necropoli of Maresha

The caves in which the residents of Hellenistic Maresha buried their dead form a ring around and outside the city limits of the Lower City, arranged in three groups: the eastern necropolis, the south-western necropolis and the northern necropolis (Kloner 2003:21–30). In this study we will concentrate on the eastern necropolis, and will not use evidence from the south-western and northern necropoli. Besides these three Hellenistic necropoli, seven constructed trough burials, presumably Persian in date, were excavated in the 1994 season in Area 940 in the eastern area of Maresha; only one contained a complete skeleton; the remainder appeared to have been emptied in antiquity.

[1] I would like to thank Dr. Rachel Barkai, the numismatist who worked on the coins from the Maresha excavations, who enabled me to use her study written here. The full numismatic report will be published in one of the coming volumes of the Maresha Excavation Final Report (in press). Secondly, I would like to thank Mrs. Sherry Whetstone for the English editing of the article.

The Eastern Necropolis

East of Maresha along a valley running north-south at a distance of ca. 250 m from the Upper City is a strip-like concentration of at least 25 hewn burial caves. The basic plan is of a rectangular hall with benches along the walls and *kokhim* (loculi) with gabled façades cut in the walls. The plans, the gabled loculi, the murals and the inscriptions found in them date these burial caves to the first half of the third century BCE. Although the population of Maresha was a mixture of Edomites, Sidonians, Greeks and peoples from other ethnic origins including Egyptians, all of them were Hellenized and used Greek.

The tomb caves of the eastern necropolis have attracted the attention of many scholars. The first three tombs were discovered and described but not drawn by Conder and Kitchener (1873:272). Clermont-Ganneau (1896:445–446) prepared a plan of the third tomb identified by Conder and Kitchener and mentioned another, which may be identical to one of those mentioned by the Survey of Western Palestine team. Peters and Thiersch (1905) published four tombs found by grave robbers in 1902. Two of these (Tombs I–II) contained wall paintings and many Greek inscriptions. In 1913 Moulton (1915:63–70) added another tomb of the same type. In 1923 the Dominican Fathers explored several more tombs (Tombs V–VII) with inscriptions (Abel 1925:267–275; Tomb VII was published twelve years earlier by Moulton). Of the approximately twenty remaining tombs in the eastern necropolis, about ten are located near and to the east of Tombs I–II. Of these, Tomb VIII characterized by its architectural elements of engaged pillars and capitals was published by Oren and Rappaport (1984:133–135).

The painted tombs published by Peters and Thiersch in 1905 are considered the most important Sidonian-Idumaean burial caves to have been discovered and will be described in detail here. Thirty inscriptions, mainly names of the deceased, and five Greek graffiti were found in Tomb I (T551); similar inscriptions were found in Tomb II (T552).

Tomb I (T551)

This is the largest (21 × 17 m) and most richly decorated tomb. It consists of an ornamented and decorated entrance hall and a passageway to

three burial chambers. A pedestal for a statue was hewn on the right side of the entrance to the middle chamber; an altar stood to the left of the entrance. There were thirteen gabled *kokhim* in the middle of the hall, six hewn in the northern wall and seven hewn in the southern wall. Long benches ran along the walls beneath them. A recess in the rear wall flanked by pilasters served as a passage to another three burial rooms. Five *kokhim* were hewn in the long walls and four in the short wall opposite the entrance in the north burial chamber. Five *kokhim* were hewn in the long walls and three in the short wall in the south chamber.

The wall paintings and inscriptions found in the tomb have attracted the most interest. A carved and painted dotted wreath decorates the longer walls of the main chamber. A continuous frieze of hunting scenes and animals runs from the south-western corner to the opposite north-western corner beneath the wreath; the majority of the animals are accompanied by inscriptions in Greek.

The first figure on the right is a youth blowing a trumpet. To his left is a rider on a horse with a beautifully decorated saddle; below him is a running hunting dog. The rider hurls a spear at an animal bleeding from a wound caused by an arrow in its breast; a second hunting dog attacks the beast from the rear. Above the rider, ΙΠΠΟ ΛΙΒΑΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΙΠΠΙΚΟΥ is written, translated by Peters and Thiersch (1905:24) as the "horse from the Lebanon of the rider". The inscription has also been rendered as the "horse of Libanus the cavalry commander" (Meyboom 1995:44, 282). ΠΑΡΔΑΛΟϹ (leopard) is painted above the hunted beast. A palm tree, painted black, separates the leopard from a stalking lion to the left, identified as a ΠΑΝΘΗΡΟϹ (panther) in the inscription above it. The figure of the next animal was destroyed when two of the *kokhim* were joined. To the left is a huge bull (ΤΑΥΡΟϹ) collapsed on bent forelegs, with blood running from its mouth. A large snake writhes to the left of the bull. Behind the bull are a giraffe (ΚΑΜΕΛΟΠΑΡΔΑΛΟϹ) facing left and a boar facing right. To the left is a griffin (ΓΡΥΨ) with a lion's body and eagle's head and wings. Facing in the same direction is a running antelope (ΟΡΥΞ) with long horns curled at the ends and a striped body. Again a tree, similar to the previous one, separates the deer from a red rhinoceros or hippopotamus ambling to the left and above it is written ΡΙΝΟΚΕΡΩϹ (rhinoceros). To his left walks a war elephant (ΕΛΕΦΑϹ) painted black and equipped with a saddle for the mahout and a canopy. The figure to the left of the elephant was destroyed in 1902 as were the faces of the

trumpeter and the rider (Peters and Thiersch 1905:2, 23). ΑΙΘΙΟΠΙΑ (Ethiopia) is inscribed above the defaced figure, apparently the symbol of Africa.

On the opposite side are two fish, one with the trunk and nose of an elephant and the other with the head of a rhinoceros. To their left is a crocodile (ΚΡΟΚΟΔΙΛΟϹ) with an ibis (ΙΒΙΣ) perched on its back. Behind them are a hippopotamus, a wild ass (ΟΝΑΓΡΙΟϹ) struggling with a snake and a wolf with a tall tuft of straight hair. To its left is another rhinoceros with one horn, which might be identified as an Indian rhinoceros (Rhinoceros unicornus). Next is a porcupine (ΥΣΤΡΙΧ) whose body is directed down and forward. Further to the left is a lynx (ΛΥΝΞ). At the end of the frieze stands a *lamassou*, a lion with a human face and beard. Beneath the frieze are painted laurel wreaths tied with red ribbons; Ionic capitals are painted below them at the tops of the pilasters and between the *kokhim*.

In the corridor (Room A) above the altar is a drawing of a red cock and on the doorjamb near the entrance to the middle hall (Room D) is an image of Kerberos (Cerberus). The recess in the middle burial chamber leading to the rear burial room is decorated with a triangular pediment similar to that of a Greek temple. The pediment is ornamented with a stylized leaf design and below it runs a Doric frieze. The two pilasters flanking the entrance are painted red and have a rosette under the capital.

On either side of the pilasters are tall black-painted amphorae, the one on the right surrounded by a white band and that on the left by a red band. The amphorae are covered with lids painted in the same colors and have long fillets tied to the handles and represent *loutrophori*. *Loutrophori*, generally made of stone, especially marble, were used to mark graves in the Greek world (Bergemann 1996). This vessel, standing above grave mounds in vase paintings and adorned with ribbons on grave reliefs' is common in Greek funerary art (Kurtz and Boardman 1971:152). This custom evidently became widespread in the Hellenistic period, mainly in the fourth and third centuries BCE. Two types of *loutrophori* existed: those with three handles (hydriae) and those with two handles (amphorae). The *loutrophori* depicted at Maresha are of the two-handled type.

The legs of a bed are carved in relief at the base of the recess. In front of the recess at either side of the pediment two eagles with outspread wings stand on a wreath which runs the entire length of the walls. Under each eagle is a yellow table whose legs end in a lion's foot.

On each table rests a white (silver) incense burner in the form of three griffins set on a base (Peters and Thiersch 1905:21).

Thirty inscriptions, mainly names of the deceased, and five Greek graffiti were found in the tomb in addition to the sixteen titles of the animals and human in the main frieze. Above the entrance to Burial Chamber XXXVI to the right of the above mentioned recess (Room E) is the epitaph of Apollophanes, son of Sesmaios, head of the Sidonian colony in Marisa (Peters and Thiersch 1905:21):

> Apollophanes, son of Sesmaios, thirty-three years chief of the Sidonians at Marisê, reputed the best and most kin-loving of all those of his time. He died, having lived seventy-four years.

Many members of his family are buried in this tomb. The names of the fathers are generally Semitic while those of the sons are Greek. The Idumaean names (Babas and names compounded with Qos) attest to the assimilation of the Sidonian family into the Edomite population among whom they dwelt, while the Greek names are evidence of gradual Hellenization.

One of the graffiti (No. 33) inscribed in four lines is either a poetic dialogue between a pair of lovers, or a letter addressed to a lover (Peters and Thiersch 1905:56–59). The interpretation of this dialogue has aroused much debate as to whether it is actually a poem, or merely a letter. Another carved inscription (No. 34) mention the priest Miron and a woman named Calypso. It is to this Calypso to whom the "poem" is attributed without any justification.

The dates mentioned in Tomb I are from the Seleucid period (196–119 BCE) and years one to five in a regnal era. The suggestion put forward by Peters and Thiersch (1905:76–80) that these dates refer to a local era at Maresha is unacceptable. The dates they suggest are too late and do not correspond to historical fact. Moreover, this hypothesis does not explain the fact that the dating under discussion includes only five years. According to Rappaport, the dating would seem rather to be Ptolemaic, in which regnal years are counted so that years A, B and E would indicate years 1, 2 and 5 of a Ptolemaic king (Oren and Rappaport 1984:148).

Ptolemy V Epiphanes ruled in Egypt between 204–180 BCE, but his control over Palestine ended with the fifth Syrian war in ca. 200 BCE. Years one to five would cover his rule in Palestine, and no later dates are to be expected. Consequently, year Z (= 7) discovered in an inscription in Tomb 500 should be attributed to an earlier Ptolemaic

king. The dates of Ptolemy V's reign are followed in the Maresha inscriptions by dates according to the Seleucid era, of which the earliest is year PIZ (year 117 of the Seleucid era), i.e. 196 BCE. Thus there is a sequence of dates at Maresha from the Ptolemaic to the Seleucid periods.

According to Oren and Rappaport (1984:149) it is clear that the family of Sesmaios began to use its tomb in Philadelphus' reign, in the first half of the third century BCE, since the great grandsons of Sesmaios were buried there in year B (203/2 BCE) and year E (200/199 BCE).

Tomb II (T552)

This tomb, about 80 m south of Tomb I, is smaller (17 × 16 m) but similar in plan to the previous tomb. The hallway opens into a central hall with five *kokhim* in each side wall. Behind it to the east is another room leading to seven small burial chambers. North of the passageway is a chamber containing eight *kokhim* and small burial rooms while the southern hall does not have *kokhim*. Above the *kokhim* in the central hall (Room D) are painted garlands interspersed with wreaths. Large amphorae–*loutrophori*–similar to those in Tomb I are painted on either side of the entrance to the central hall. Tall candelabra with burning candles are painted on the pilasters between the central hall and the one behind it; two small figures are painted beside each candelabrum (Peters and Thiersch 1905:32). A fresco showing a man crowned with a wreath, wearing a striped tunic and playing a double flute is painted on the wall to the left of the door to the central burial room (XVII). Behind him walks a woman wearing a multicolored dress and playing a harp. A libation scene and, behind it, a tripod and kantharos are painted on the right side of the opening. Twelve inscriptions, dated by Thiersch and Peters from 188–135 BCE were found in Tomb II.

The burial caves at Maresha are similar to ones at Alexandria from the time of the Ptolemaic dynasty of the early Hellenistic period (McKenzie 1990:63–69). The closest parallel to Tomb I (T551) and Tomb II (T552) is found at Shatby, Alexandria. The gabled *kokh*, characteristic of almost all the Maresha tombs appears in Hypogeum A at Shatby, dated to 280–250 BCE (McKenzie 1990:63–64).

The paintings in the Maresha tombs are mainly characterized by Greek sepulchral elements: eagles, the flute and harp players, Kerberos, the cock and the amphorae (Kloner 2000) and possibly the rider. The

present author does not necessarily agree with D. Jacobson's conclusion that elements of the Greek god Dionysus and his cult are portrayed here, and therefore disagrees with his dating; preferring instead the first part of the third century BCE (Jacobson 2004:24–39). The animal frieze in Tomb I is influenced by Ptolemaic menagerie drawings such as those known from Hellenistic Alexandria. There was great popular interest in the natural sciences under Aristotle's influence. From descriptions of the menageries of Ptolemy II (according to Agatharchides) we know they included lions, leopards and other felines, rodents, buffaloes from India and Africa, a wild ass from Moab, large snakes, a giraffe, a rhinoceros and various birds—some of the very animals represented at Maresha. The griffin was a Persian legacy. The animal with the human face is a version of the Assyrian *lamassou* (a fabulous creature with a lion's body, eagle's wings and human face, statues of which guarded palace entrances). Fish with an elephant's or rhinoceros' face are taken from legends based on the belief of Greek scholars that an exact correspondence existed between land and marine animals. Hellenistic "travel stories" are replete with descriptions of animals of this kind, which were found, they claimed, in remote corners of the earth. The animal frieze at Maresha is a unique document of its kind in the Hellenistic world. Only Roman mosaics, like those at Palestrina which postdates ours by ca. 140 years, show influences from the same Hellenistic-Egyptian sources which the artist at Maresha used for his inspiration (Meyboom 1995:43–80). The Maresha wall paintings should be classified as provincial in comparison with other western Hellenistic centers such as Palestrina (Roll 1985).

Tomb IV (T554)

Third century CE constructions and use were found in Tomb IV (T554), which was not decorated with paintings but is important because of its inscriptions (Peters and Thiersch 1905:29–33; Kloner 2003: 25–26). The inscriptions that were written in two different scripts and the plan of the tomb attest to chronological stages in the functioning of the cave: it was hewn around the mid-third century BCE and the incised inscriptions were made about that time and toward the end of the century; the painted inscriptions were added at the end of the third and during the second century BCE. The majority of the names are Greek, a few are Semitic, i.e., Idumaean or Sidonian (Avi-Yonah and Kloner 1993:955; Kloner 2003:25–26).

Tomb T561

In 1985, during the course of work to deepen the bed of the highway along the ancient road from Beth Guvrin to the Hebron Hills, another burial cave (T561) was discovered in the eastern necropolis not far from Tomb I (Kloner 2003:26–27). This was the first tomb ever discovered at Maresha that had not been broken into by grave robbers and was resealed when the road was paved. The cave was discovered during a survey of Subterranean Complex 71 when the examination of a plastered crack in the complex led us to one of the *kokhim*. From the *kokh* it was possible to reach a rectangular hall (4.1 m long, 3.5 m wide and 2.2 m high) along the walls of which was a low stone bench (0.40 m wide and 0.50 m high). In the south the wide, high entrance to the hall was blocked with masonry. Most of the *kokhim* were 2.2 m long and 0.70 m wide. Each had a gabled facade and roof 1.3 m above floor level. The *kokhim* were sealed with masonry and contained primary burials. *Kokh* 7 held the remains of a man and woman laid in opposite directions: one inward, the other facing the opening of the *kokh*. Only *Kokh* 3 contained collected bones, belonging to nine adults and two children. A few bones of those buried in this *kokh* were found in other *kokhim*, in which they had been buried first—another indication of secondary burial. A quarter of those buried in the tomb were youths and infants. The bones of three adults showed identifiable signs of tuberculosis, a very rare phenomenon in archaeological finds. Ten pieces of pottery were found in the tomb; nine fusiform *unguentaria* which by their form indicated an early Hellenistic use of the cave, and a small jar (Regev 1994:272; Kloner 2003:26–27). The pottery allowed us to date the tomb to the first half of the third century BCE. The tomb also contained fragments of glass vessels, a bronze ring and bracelet, and an iron ring and iron axe. Only one graffito was found with an unclear name that might be read as ΜΕΓΙC[ΤΑC].

The Evidence from Khirbet Za'aquqa

The third evidence of a completely Hellenized population, from a village or farmhouse and not a main economic center, is found in a burial tomb at Khirbet Za'aquqa, about 6 km east of Marissa (Regev and Rappaport 1992:25*–50* English pp. 175–177). Approximately twenty

separate graffiti were found in this large loculus cave, of which sixteen were read and published. These contained thirty-three personal Greek names and indications of kinship, as well as one date (the twelfth regnal year of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, corresponding to 272/1 BCE), all of them written in Greek. In none of the tombs at Maresha and Khirbet Za'aquqa were any names found written in Aramaic, another indication of the high degree of Hellenization in Idumaea.

The cave was cut into the chalk slope and fronted with a dromos-like courtyard, most of which has not been excavated. The rectangular burial chamber has a narrow shelf running along three walls, from which 14 large loculi (average size 1.2m wide, 2.3m long and 1.6m high) were hewn into the walls. The loculi, larger than those in the contemporary cemetery at Marissa, appear to have been intended to accommodate wooden coffins.

Numerous inscriptions and graffiti were incised on the cave walls, including human portraits, architectural representations and a boat. The reading of the better preserved inscriptions follows:

1. Year 12. Of Boutas son of Demophilos.
2a. Year 12. Of B…./ …/ son of …
3. Diodotos son of Demophilos.
4a. And of Rhodion, daughter of Demophilos.
4b. Of Bryon son of B…
5a. Of Demophilos son of Bryon.
5b. And of Rhodion daughter of Demophilos.
6. Of Botrichos and of Dorotheos his father.
7a. Of Athenion daughter of Demophilos.
8. Of Athenion.
9a. Of Athenion daughter of Demophilos.
9b. Of the father of everyone.
9c. Of Demophilos, the father of everyone.
10. Of Nikobos son of Lys[imachos].
11. Of Botrichos son of Botrichos.
12. And the son of Dorotheos.
13a. Baukis.
14. Of Philoklea wife of Dorotheos.
15a. Of Demophilos son of Dorotheos.
15b. Of Hegesias and/Byron (his/the) son/ of Hermias' wife.
16. Of Byron Geonios (?)/ of Hedylion.

For the year appearing in Inscriptions 1 and 2, the twelth regnal year of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (272/1 BCE) is proposed as the most plausible of several late fourth/early third century BCE possibilities. The interpretation of the year as the age of the deceased appears

unlikely, as its placement at the beginning of the inscription is consistent with date, rather than age, which usually comes at the end.

The onomasticon is purely Greek with no identifiable regional characteristics like Idumaean, Arab or Judahite names, and may be ascribed to Greek settlers who arrived during the early Hellenistic period—a date supported by the material culture remains found in the tomb. During the three or four generations that the tomb was in use, there is no sign of intermingling with local Idumaeans or other Semitic groups.

At the beginning of the third century BCE and especially at the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus the Greek language had become dominant among the local population, as testified by the names inscribed in the tombs of Marissa and Za'aquqa. It is worth mentioning that in the burial chambers, one of the places where the most traditional practices are kept, no inscription written in any language other than Greek is found. By contrast, ostraca written in Aramaic used by the Idumaeans from the third and beginning of the second century BCE were found in subterranean complexes and other surface areas, but not in burial caves. These Aramaic ostraca were used for the most personal and private purposes, including a marriage contract dated to 176 BCE. Greek presumably reached Marissa directly from Alexandria, and it is amazing how quickly it became the dominant language used in the daily life of Idumaea.

HERAKLEOPOLIS MAGNA UNDER PHILADELPHUS

Erja Salmenkivi

Herakleopolis Magna, in Egyptian (*Ḥwt)-nn(y)-nswt*, Coptic ϩNHC, modern Ihnasija el-Medina, was the nome capital of a quite densely populated area in middle Egypt. During the First Intermediate Period (ca. 2170/2120–2025/2020 BC), Herakleopolis was the seat of the ninth and tenth dynasties, and again during the Third Intermediate Period, the area around Herakleopolis was strategically important as a fortress for the rulers of the twenty-second Dynasty.[1] The site was religiously important throughout the Pharaonic history,[2] and what makes it, to my mind, interesting during the Ptolemaic period is that it represents a kind of traditional administrative unit along the Nile: it is not an exceptional area such as the Fayyum,[3] and it is also not known to be the stronghold of the native Egyptian resistance of the Macedonian rulers as the Thebaid.

The Greek nome *Herakleopolites* corresponded approximately to the twentieth Upper Egyptian nome *Naret-Khentet*, near the border between Upper and Lower Egypt.[4] The topography of this nome based on the Greek and Latin sources has been thoroughly studied by Maria Rosaria Falivene (= Falivene 1998). Her book, however, excludes the sources on the metropolis,[5] but she notes that: "Even at the time when the Greeks called it Herakleopolis, this was an important town, deserv-

[1] Gomaà 1977, 1124–1127. The dates of the First Intermediate period follow Beckerath 1997, 143–145; 188. About the 22nd Dynasty, see Kitchen 1986, chapters 7 and 18–20. The Spanish-Egyptian archaeologists have continued to work more or less continuously at the necropoleis of the First and Third Intermediate periods since the 1960's, see, most recently, Pérez Die 2004, 63–88.

[2] See further Mokhtar 1983.

[3] See, for example, Thompson 2001, 1255.

[4] The neighbouring nomes were Arsinoites to the north-west, Memphites to the north, Aphroditopolites to the north-east and Kynopolites to the south-east on the east bank of the Nile and Oxyrhynchites to the south. The northern border of the nome ran near Abu Sir al-Malaq (⟨ Bousiris ⟨ *Pr-wsjr-mḥt-3bḏw*) both during the Pharaonic and the Graeco-Roman periods, cf. Montet 1957, 193; Falivene 1998, 21; Salmenkivi 2002, 13–15. About the southern border near al-Hiba, see further note 11 below.

[5] Falivene 1998, xv.

ing a special study which cannot be attempted here."[6] On the other hand, Ulrich Wilcken noted, in his 1903 article on papyrus excavations in Herakleopolis Magna, that our knowledge of the Ptolemaic town is almost nonexistent. He wrote: "Doch wird Herakleopolis und der herakleopolitische Gau mehrfach in ptolemäischen Papyri erwähnt, freilich ohne daß wir über die Stadt selbst daraus Genaueres erführen."[7] My attempt in this paper (and especially in a forthcoming study on Hellenistic Herakleopolis Magna) is to challenge Wilcken's statement and to study the evidence from the large number of Ptolemaic papyri that have been published during the past ca. 100 years and concern directly (or indirectly) this metropolis.

These papyri derive mostly from mummy cartonnages excavated (or plundered) from three different sites, that is, the necropolis near modern Abu Sir al-Malaq that has yielded mostly texts dating to the first century BC, that of ancient Tebtynis (which, from the administrative point of view, belonged to neighbouring Arsinoites to the north-west), and the necropolis near modern al-Hiba.[8] More work is still needed on the first century BC documents, but the sophisticated control system of the central government in the Herakleopolite Nome is well attested in the official archives[9] of the *basilikoi grammateis* who appear mostly in *Berliner Griechische Urkunden* VIII (published in 1933), and XVIII.1 (published in 2000). These officials worked at the nome level of the administration and thus, the logical place where the documents were written and filed is Herakleopolis Magna.[10] The first and third volumes of the *Tebtynis Papyri*, as well as cartonnage texts that have found their way into various collections around the world, have yielded documents mostly from the second century BC. The bulk of the third century BC documents derive from the cartonnages that were excavated by Bernard Grenfell and Arthur Hunt near modern al-Hiba at the beginning of

[6] Falivene 1998, xiii.

[7] Wilcken 1903, 313.

[8] Cartonnages are covers manufactured to protect the mummified deceased. The raw material used was recycled waste papyri, cf. D. Thompson's article.

[9] The term 'archive' is certainly justified in these cases. It is sometimes used to refer to a collection of papers only loosely connected with each other, cf., for example, Verhoogt 1998, 22ff. Such documents, however, should be referred to as a dossier, cf. Pestman 1995, 91–92.

[10] See further Salmenkivi 2002, 54; Falivene 1998, 13; Habermann 1998, 149. About the role of the *basilikos grammateus* as a controlling official working at the Nome level of the administration, see Handrock 1967, 89–90; Oates 1995, esp. 95–100; cf. Sarischouli in *BGU* XVIII.1 Einleitung 24–34.

the 20th century. Thus, the evidence from the 3rd century is biased towards the southern part of the Herakleopolite Nome or to neighbouring Oxyrhynchites to the south-west and south of Herakleopolites.[11]

At first, I set myself to trace documents that would originate from Herakleopolis on the basis of personnel working at the nome level (such as the *basilikoi grammateis* mentioned above), but this approach proved to be unfruitful for a couple of reasons. For one, the titles of the persons involved in the official correspondence of the 3rd century attested in the *Hibeh Papyri* are hardly ever mentioned, and thus, these people are extremely difficult to identify.[12] Furthermore, the bulk of the material seems to originate from the Oxyrhynchite Nome, or perhaps from Phebichis, the administrative centre of the southernmost toparchy of Herakleopolites, that is the Koites.[13] The area around al-Hiba may actually have been more or less independent in the third century, and Falivene has suggested that the Koites could have at least partly coincided with a 'noncanonical' Nineteenth Upper Egyptian nome "of the He-Goat" in some pre-Ptolemaic lists of nomes.[14] Thus, I will make a few observations on some *Hibeh Papyri* dating to the reign of Philadelphus, and I will discuss the origin of some texts that have *not* been found in the excavations of the Egypt Exploration Society directed by Grenfell and Hunt.

---

[11] About the dating of the texts from Abu Sir al-Malaq, Tebtynis, and al-Hiba, see Falivene 1998, 13–23; cf. Salmenkivi 2002, 28–51. Al-Hiba, the Greek Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις, belonged to the Koites, an area that might have covered the southernmost part of Herakleopolites as well as the north-western parts of Oxyrhynchites, cf. Falivene 1994, 203–209. On the historical interpretation of texts from cartonnages, see Dorothy Thompson's article in this volume.

[12] Towards the end of the third century, the situation changes as the number of documents increases. As an example I would like to mention the correspondence of the banker called Kleitarchos whose correspondence with a certain Asklepiades is preserved from the time of Euergetes I (ca. 230–227 BC, see P.Yale I 47–39). Asklepiades is the superior of Kleitarchos, and as the editors suggest (P.Yale I, p. 131), he may well have been the banker in charge of the whole Herakleopolite Nome stationed at Herakleopolis.

[13] Falivene has even suggested that a possible origin for both literary and documentary texts of the *Hibeh Papyri* could be al-Hiba itself, see Falivene 1997, 273–280.

[14] Falivene 1998, 12. Several studies on the administration based on the Hibeh material have already appeared. One example is Harimouthes, who is referred to as *nomarches* (P.Hib. I 85, 261 BC) and later *toparches* (P.Hib. I 44, 253 BC). The discrepancy in his titles has been discussed, among others, by Samuel 1966, 213–229; cf. Falivene 1991, 203–227. I would like to suggest that this 'demotion' in his status could be an indication of reorganisation of the administration, and Koites could have been absorbed into the Herakleopolite Nome in the 250s BC.

Table of some relevant passages of the *Hibeh Papyri*:

Passage / document	*Date*	*Contents*	*Persons involved*	*Mummy #*	*Notes*
1. P.Hib. I 30 ll. 24–25: ἐν | [τῶι ἐν Ἡρ]ακλέους πόλει δικαστηρίωι	282–274	A copy of summons	Nikanor, Perdikkas	6	l. 26: δι' Ἐπιμένους Other texts from mummy #5: P.Hib. 31, 39, 84(b), 97, 100, 101,
P.Yale 26 (= Hib. 148)	early III	Antichretic Loan	Epimenes, Poros	5	147 (P.Hib. I 101
P.Hib. I 84 (a)	284	Sale of wheat	Epimenes, Timokles	5	mentions Libanos, a *sitologos*, cf. BGU XIV 2391&2392)
2. P.Hib. I 92 ll. 12–13: ἐν [Ἡρακ]λέους πόλει ἐπὶ | Κ̣ρ̣ι̣ρ̣[ίππου]] τοῦ [σ]τ[ρ]α̣τ̣η̣γ̣[ο]ῦ̣	264	Contract of surety	Mnason and Hegemon acting as sureties for Timokles who lives in Muchinaryo (Oxy.)	97	Other texts from mummy #97: P.Hib. I 28, 29, 64 (= P.Yale 28), 92, 146
3. P.Hib. I 110, verso, ll. 78–80: Δημητρίω[ι] | τῶι πρὸς τῆι χορηγία[ι τ]ῶν ἐλεφάντῳ[ν] | εἰς τὴν Θηβαίδα κυ(λιστὸν) α	Recto ca. 270, verso ca. 255	Accounts Postal register	Several names mentioned in both documents	18	Other texts from mummy #18: P.Hib. I 9, 63, 65, 94, 157–159

A *dikasterion* in Herakleopolis is mentioned in P.Hib. I 30, which preserves a copy of two summons for recovery of a debt (see table above, number 1). The persons involved in these cases are Greek soldiers, and at the end of the document, there is a note *di' Epimenous*. This Epimenes also appears in P.Yale I 26 (part of the *Hibeh Papyri* published in the first volume were presented to the Yale collection and re-published in P.Yale I, 26–35) and P.Hib. I 84 (a). The editors of the Yale text speculate on the possibility that the troop of Epimenes at Bubastis, referred to in P.Hib. I 81 (239 BC), may have been named after this same Epimenes. In P.Hib.I 84 (a), Epimenes is defined as an Athenian (= *PP* E25) and he sells 30 *artabai* wheat to Timokles from the new crops of his estate at the village of Peroe which belonged to the Koites toparchy.[15] Since P.Hib. I 92 (also from a cartonnage that has yielded

[15] Falivene 1998, *s.v.* ΠΕΡΟΗ.

quite early documents, see table number 2) states that the persons acting as sureties for a certain Simos should (ll. 11–14): "deliver him up at Herakleopolis before Krisippos the *strategos*", I find it tempting to suggest that Epimenes, who obviously was a holder of land by military tenure (*kleruchos*), could have been an agent of the *strategos*, living at Peroe, which was most likely located close to Phebichis.

The strong presence of the military settlers in Herakleopolites is also attested in P.Hib. II 198 (ll. 1–36 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 1–4), a collection of royal ordinances of which the oldest are dated to the reign of Philadelphus. Lines 20–27 preserve a *prostagma* concerning the soldiers in the Herakleopolite Nome. The passage is unfortunately only partially preserved, but the area was certainly important, located both at a crossroads between north and south and serving as a gateway to the western desert and Libya. An interesting glimpse of the settlers in the *metropolis* itself is provided by P.Köln VII, 314 dated to the twenty-ninth year of Philadelphus (8 of July, 257 BC). Nikaios, son of Charixenos, Ἀχαιὸς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς (*PP* E298) declares his garden, for tax purposes, which is located "within the walls near the goose-pen on temple land" (ll. 7–9). He estimates the income of the garden to be two hundred *drachmai* of which he will pay a tenth (δεκάτη) to the Temple of Herakles.[16] This was obviously the main temple of the town dedicated to the Egyptian Harsaphes whom the Greeks interpreted as Herakles. The oldest excavated remains of the temple of Harsaphes date to the Middle Kingdom.[17]

Another interesting detail concerning the town is that there must have been a harbour in or nearby Herakleopolis since an account of the income and the expenses of a boat which traded between Memphis, Aphroditopolis, Herakleopolis, Bousiris, and Ptolemais is preserved in

[16] P.Köln VII, 314, ll. 2–16: (ἔτους) κϑ Δαισίου ς, Αἰγυπ[τίων] | δὲ Παχὼνς ις. ἀπογρά[φεται] | Νίκαιος Χαριξένου Ἀχαιὸς | τῆς ἐπιγονῆς ὑπάρχειν | αὐτῶι ἐν Ἡρακλέους π[ό]λει ἐντὸς τείχους πρὸς | τοῖς χηνοβοσκίοις ἐν τῆι | ἱερᾶι γῆι κῆπον ἀρουρῶν | τριῶν καὶ τετάρτου | ὀγδόου, ὡς βασιλικοὶ γραμ|ματεῖς ἀναφέρουσιν. Τού|του συντελῶ τὴν δεκά|την εἰς τὸ Ἡρακλεῖον. Τι|μῶμαι τοὺς καρποὺς | δραχμῶν διακοσίων. Prof. Thompson noted during the conference that a highly interesting detail of this text is that the person who is said to be a descendant (τῆς ἐπιγονῆς) of an Achaian settler is claiming the right of a settler *not* born in Egypt, that is, paying only a tenth instead of a sixth of the income of a garden, cf. the commentary of P.Köln VII, 314 by the editor Klaus Maresch, and Thompson in this volume.

[17] For further information on the excavations and the Harsaphes temple see, for example, Mokhtar 1983, 75 ff.

the Zenon archive (P.Cairo Zen. IV 59753).[18] (Wilcken even cites the tale of the Eloquent Peasant to support the mentioning of a harbour in a late fourth century AD document [BGU III 943 from AD 389].)[19]

An observation worth noting is that some cartonnage texts dating to the third century and published in the *Berliner Griechische Urkunden*-series might well have been plundered from al-Hiba as they were purchased by Friedrich Zucker in Mallawi in the early 1910s.[20] This observation is not without relevance in considering the origin of certain documents published in *BGU* X. As an example, I would like to mention the correspondence between Kallistratos and Akestias attested in *BGU* X 1911–1916. In *BGU* 1913, it is mentioned that some one has sailed to a place called Hiera Nesos and the interesting thing about this person is that he has sailed there with elephants (ll. 2–3). The text of BGU X 1913, fragment A, runs as follows:

]αν σοι . [.....]τος δὲ
ἔπλει εἰς Ἱερὰ[ν] νῆσον [με-]
τὰ τῶν ἐλεφάντων
[ὥ]στε [νῦν] καιρὸν εἶναι
[ἀπ]οστεῖλαι [
[.....] δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν

One of the several villages known as Hiera Nesos is certainly connected with the Herakleopolite Nome.[21] Another place name attested in the Kallistratos correspondence is Dikomia (*BGU* X 1911, 7), also very probably in north-eastern part of the Herakleopolites.[22] On the basis

[18] About the so-called Zenon archive see, for example, Pestman *et alii* 1981; Clarysse and Vandorpe 1995. A street leading from the town to the harbor is also mentioned in *P.Phrur.Diosk.* 6, 10, dated to the 3rd of November 146 BC.

[19] Wilcken 1903, 316. *BGU* III 924–958 are the only surviving documents of the altogether 80 boxes full of papyri deriving from Wilcken's papyrus excavations which were burned in the Hamburg harbor, see Wilcken 1903, 333; Preisendanz 1933, 165.

[20] Cf. Salmenkivi 1997, 1083–1087. Falivene, too, suspects that the provenance of many documents in various German collections is al-Hiba, see Falivene 1998, 14–15 and notes. Even though Mallawi is located ca. 100 km to the south of al-Hiba, it might have been the town to which the locals took their goods to sell to the European buyers.

[21] *Hierai Nesoi* are attested both in the district of Polemon and that of Herakleides in the Arsinoites, and in the Thebaid during the Ptolemaic period. One Hiera Nesos in the Hermopolite Nome is attested in *SB* 16, 12948 from AD 448. About the Herakleopolite Hiera Nesos see further Falivene 1998, *s.v.* ΙΕΡΑ ΝΗΣΟΣ.

[22] The Herakleopolite origin is also implied by Bingen 1976, 186. About Hiera Nesos

of P.Petr. II 20, it has been argued that the main stables for the contingent of war elephants were at Memphis,[23] but it seems that they were also, at least temporarily, stationed in or transported through the Herakleopolite nome.

Unfortunately, the Kallistratos correspondence does not tell us anything more about these elephants.[24] These elephants, however, bring us to the wider issue of obtaining and maintaining them for various purposes. War elephants played a crucial part in several battles of the Diadochoi described by the ancient historiographers, elephants had a current value in the affairs of the Hellenistic kings, and they were used in religious festivals such as the famous procession of the first Ptolemaieia organised by Philadelphus in winter 279/8 BC.[25] Lionel Casson has shown that it was indeed Philadelphus who was the first of the Ptolemies to organise (in large scale) the hunting of these beasts from Africa in the areas of modern Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somalia.[26] It was important for the Ptolemies not to rely on the Indian sources of elephants since the way to import them to Egypt would have been overland through Seleucid territory.[27]

The hunting of the African elephants involved recruiting hundreds of hunters and tamers as well as solving the problem of how to transport live elephants to Egypt. The latter meant that a certain kind of ship, an ἐλεφαντηγός, that was able to navigate with elephants along the coast of the Red Sea had to be built. According to Casson, elephants were most likely transported by the sea up to the port of Berenike from which they were marched to the Nile valley along the desert

---

and Dikomia in the area between the Arsinoite and Herakleopolite Nomes, see Falivene 1998, 10.

[23] See Casson 'A Petrie Papyrus', 89 and Stanley Burstein's article in this volume.

[24] Four further unpublished documents now in the collection of the University of Jena (P.Jena inv. 717, 718, 725, 726) belong to the same archive and have been extracted from a cartonnage from al-Hiba (al-Hiba provenance is given to inv. numbers 658–1097), see Uebel 1970, 493. The Jenaer papyri bare no witness on the origin of the Kallistratos correspondence or on the elephants (for this information I am grateful to Marius Gerhardt, e-mail of September 22, 2005). Three out of the four Jenaer papyri are now available at http://papyri.uni-leipzig.de.

[25] See further Scullard 1974, *passim*. About the dating of the procession of Philadelphus, see Thompson 2000, 365–388.

[26] Casson 'Hunting of African Elephants', 247–260. About the occurrence and distribution of African Forest elephant (*loxodonta africana cyclotis*, a smaller race than the better known African Bush elephant) in Antiquity, see Scullard 1974, 24–31; 129 fig. 13.

[27] See further Casson 'Hunting of African Elephants'; Scullard 1974; Vranopoulos 1975, 130–146 (with a short English summary).

road between Berenike and Koptos. From there on, the beasts were transported further north along the Nile.[28] All this must have given work to a number of people, such as the Demetrios mentioned in P.Hib. I 110, 78–80 (see table number 3) with the title "the one in charge of the supplies for the elephants (in the Thebaid)". In the same document, elephants are mentioned in connection with an unidentifiable place name beginning with Tha- or The-. I find it tempting to think that the latter place was situated in the Herakleopolite Nome, perhaps close to the Hiera Nesos mentioned in the Kallistratos correspondence.

To sum up: even though the original purpose of this paper was to discuss one of the nome metropoleis from the point of view of administration, the evidence at hand—that is Greek documentary papyri—took us to issues with a wider perspective such as settling the countryside with Greek soldiers or the organisation of hunting and maintaining elephants for various purposes. I hope that these few examples have illustrated that local history can reveal interesting aspects of Ptolemaic Egypt and that a further study on Herakleopolis Magna is justified.

[28] Casson 'Hunting of African Elephants', 252–258; Krebs 1965, 96–101.

SECTION DELTA

HOW HAS IT NOT OCCURRED TO ANY OF THE HISTORIANS OR POETS TO MAKE MENTION OF SUCH ENORMOUS ACHIEVEMENTS?

PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS AND JEWISH WRITINGS: ARISTOBULUS AND PSEUDO-ARISTEAS AS EXAMPLES OF ALEXANDRIAN JEWISH APPROACHES

Johann Cook

Ptolemy II Philadelphus clearly had a great impact upon Jews in Egypt and Palestine. He is mentioned in the Zenon papyri as well as in Aristobulus and the book of Aristeas (B.Ar.).[1] These writings are evidence that Judaism was fundamentally influenced by Hellenism. The question is to what extent? These two authors show clear signs of using Hellenistic ideas. Aristobulus had the intention "to demonstrate that Jewish doctrine as presented in the Pentateuch, i.e. the Greek translation of the Mosaic law, represented the true 'philosophy' and did not contradict philosophically trained reason" (Hengel 1974:164). Aristeas had a rather ambivalent perspective on Greek philosophy. On the one hand, he calls the God of Israel Zeus or Dis; on the other hand, he regards the cultic activities of the Greeks as vain and useless. In this paper I will compare the mentioned authors with the Septuagint version of Proverbs in order to determine the impact of Hellenism on these authors.

The Book of Aristeas

In the legendary letter by Aristeas, apparently an administrator from the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, to his brother, he gives details of an important mission to Eleazar, the high priest in Jerusalem. The letter was written on the request of Demetrius of Phaleron, the famous director of the Alexandrian library, who wanted a copy of the Jewish law to be added to the list of original documents. On the basis of a suggestion by Aristeas, the king had this letter drafted in which, *inter alia*, he expresses his regret about the Jewish exiles who were brought forcibly to Alexandria in the past. A delegation from the king, including

[1] In the most recent study on this writing, Sylvie Honigman (2003:1) argues that this is in fact not a letter but, with Josephus, she opts to define it as a book.

Aristeas, is then sent to Jerusalem with the request to have a copy of the Law of Moses prepared. After meeting the high priest, the delegation returned to Alexandria with seventy-two translators in order to execute their task:

> They were men who had not only acquired proficiency in Jewish literature, but had studied most carefully that of the Greeks as well. (par. 121, Charles 1913)

Upon their arrival back home they are entertained by Ptolemy at a banquet that lasts for a week. During this time the king meets each translator and puts to them all sorts of questions which all of them answer with great wisdom. Then the translation is undertaken and seventy-two translators (six from each Israelite tribe) are accommodated in a specially prepared house on the island of Pharos; after seventy-two days they complete their work. The translation is then read aloud to the Jewish community of Alexandria and the translations are perfectly concordant.

Earlier most scholars would have agreed that the genre of B.Ar. should be described as that of *Pseudepigraphon* (Meisner 1977:37). This term certainly fits the legendary and seemingly fictitious nature of the story. Dines (2004:28) talks of a "mixture of literary genres" which, according to her, is typical of Hellenistic literature. Honigman (2003:33), however, has come up with a new proposal, namely that it should be read against its Hellenistic, Alexandrian background. To her two prominent literary notions bear witness to this background: ring composition and the blending of genres (Honigman 2003:15). These notions also provide possible solutions to burning issues in earlier interpretations of B.Ar., such as the large number of digressions. These have in the past been attributed to late interpolations (Février 1925). Honigman (2003:16), however, demonstrates that these digressions are indeed functional, each belonging to a different literary genre. The intention of the compositional structure is diversity (*poikilia*), a well-known Hellenistic literary principle (Honigman 2003:16).

Honigman suggests that this treatise should not be read with modern eyes—asking irrelevant questions as to whether the narrative is true or false, but that its genre should be defined as *historiography*. She takes a cue from the Hellenistic environment in which B.Ar. functioned and applies the criteria of Hellenistic historiography in order to define its genre (Honigman 2003:30). According to this interpretation, the author indeed intended the B.Ar. to be seen as 'true history'. Accordingly, in

the introduction and the conclusion B.Ar. is defined as a *diegesis*; hence Honigman concludes it is a historical diegesis, or even "a kind of historical monograph" (Honigman 2003:30). Honigman presents nuanced arguments and indeed discusses the formal aspects of *diegema* or *diegesis*. One of the conventions of Greek historiography is that the introduction should reveal what the subject matter of the following account is going to be. This is done in B.Ar. The author of B.Ar. also conforms to these criteria as far as the presentation of his topic is concerned (Honigman 2003:30). Moreover, the principle of blending operates in the composition of B.Ar. and more specifically Chapter 4 (Honigman 2003:31). The subject matter of this chapter, with its discussion of the freeing of slaves, is mentioned already in the introduction and hence was deemed of central importance by the author. Two additional subjects from history, Herodotus and Diodorus, are mentioned as possible precedents which could have been known to the author of B.Ar. (Honigman 2003:30).

Two further issues are important in Honigman's narrative interpretation; the first concerns the *composition* of B.Ar., and the second has to do with B.Ar. as a *charter myth*. As far as the first is concerned, Honigman also takes the Alexandrian literary context into account as the basis for her interpretation. She demonstrates that the author indeed applied literary techniques such as ring composition in order to create a homogeneous impression of Judaism at the time. Hence to her the entire B.Ar. represents a deliberate literary construction, even though she accepts that the author made use of oral traditions and a number of external sources. One example is what she calls the secondary theme, that of equating the status of the LXX with that of the Hebrew Law (Honigman 2003:53). She interprets the first episode, namely the liberation of the Jewish slaves referred to above, in conjunction with the story of the Exodus in the Hebrew Bible—that Jews were brought to Egypt as slaves. She does, however, add a creative interpretation to the effect that Ptolemy is willing to let the people free, as opposed to the Pharaoh, which means that "The Law can and will be received in Alexandria" and hence B.Ar. is the story of a non-Exodus (Honigman 2003:56).

The second episode, the selection of the elders in Jerusalem, according to her, is also functional in the whole narrative and especially relevant to the third episode, the proclamation of the translation of the law in Alexandria. As in the case of Exodus 24:3–7, the translation (law) is read aloud before the people and acclaimed. Significant in this regard is that the author (according to Honigman 2003:59) is combining two

models, one Jewish and one Greek, since the process is likened to the promulgation of official classical texts in Greek cities.

Fundamental to Honigman's interpretation is her view that the Aristeas document should be seen as a charter myth, a term coined by Malinowski (Honigman 2003:38). Again Honigman offers a nuanced argument. In this context myth has nothing to do with the story being true or false, but with how the readers or listeners perceive it. And according to her, the author purposefully composed and structured B.Ar. into a myth that would be believed by its readers. She demonstrates that the author actually utilised narrative devices, such as ego-narrative (the authorial 'I' in Greek historiography: Honigman 2003:67) and the appropriate insertion of documents, in order to create the notion of the trustworthiness of the narrative.

The definition *historiography* is thus not a statement of *wie es eigentlich gewesen war*, but truth in the sense of how the intended readers of B.Ar. in fact perceived it to be. This interpretation stands in stark contrast to that by J.W. Wevers (1985:17): "Since the time of Hody it has been clear that the story was made up out of whole cloth—it is fiction—and there is no good reason to believe any of it; in fact, it would be methodologically sound not to accept anything stated in the *Letter* that cannot be substantiated elsewhere". This brings me to the issue of the dating of B.Ar.

The historical placing of the book of Aristeas varies from the end of the third century BCE through the second century CE (Fernández Marcos 2000:41). Closer precision is, however, possible as demonstrated by Meisner (1977:37). He follows Bickermann (1930) and argues that it should be dated between 127–118 BCE. Honigman (2003:129) again combines the views by Meecham (1935) and Hadas (1973) in opting for a somewhat later date "shortly before 145" (Honigman 2003:130). There is thus a consensus in favour of the second century BCE (Jobes and Silva 2000:34, but cf. Dorival 1994:42) and that it should not be seen as a contemporary document (Jellicoe 1993:46).

In the past many scholars have argued that the purpose of this letter is apologetic in nature (Marcos 2000:43).[2] One prominent interpretation in this regard is that it is an apology for the original Greek

[2] Dorival (1994:43) refers to three possible lines of propaganda: "1. une apologie de la traduction grecque de la Torah; 2. un ouvrage de propagande en faveur du judaïsme à l'intention des Grecs; and 3. une œuvre de propagande en faveur du judaïsme à l'intention des Juifs".

translation.[3] Kahle (1959) rejected this interpretation and compared the LXX with the Targumim. Brock (1979) demonstrated that it is actually related to the later revisionary activity in the Septuagint. Thus he deems it as a rejection of unnecessary tampering with the Greek translations by scribes[4] because they differed from the Hebrew in many places. Honigman also thinks that B.Ar. has to do with the transmission history of the LXX. She takes seriously the Alexandrian origins of B.Ar. in her interpretation by claiming that the author actually followed Alexandrian literary practices and more specifically the text-critical work of Aristarchos on the edition of Homer in the creation of new manuscripts, since older mss had become inferior because they had deteriorated badly (Honigman 2003:131). She bases her ingenious inference on the supposition that Aristarchos, as fifth head of the Alexandrian library, brought about a reform in the production of Homeric poems, a reform that supposedly spilt over also into the Jewish community (Honigman 2003:130). She phrases this as follows: "A new awareness of the importance of accurate wording of a text was developing. Learned Jews (who taught the Law in the synagogue) realized that the quality of the LXX manuscripts in circulation had deteriorated, and that this situation suddenly became intolerable" (Honigman 2003:131).

Honigman thus presents a new theory on the intention of the passage on the promulgation of the law. This is not an entirely novel idea, since it builds partly upon the ideas of Orlinsky (1975) and Kahle (1959). However, that it is an ingenious theory must be immediately conceded. Nevertheless, it is hypothetical, even though Honigman refers to some comparable textual material from the Alexandrian context. The problem remains that there is no primary evidence connecting it to the LXX. The theory by Brock is also a hypothetical one, although there are ample examples of existing revisions of Biblical texts.[5]

As far as the intention of B.Ar. is concerned, Honigman also distinguishes between the intent of the passage on the law and that of the writing as a whole. She does accept the Jewishness of this writing and in numerous instances she actually refers to the fact that the intended readership of B.Ar. is a Jewish one (Honigman 2003:29). Yet, she main-

[3] Jellicoe (1993:47) phrases this as follows: "On any account, it is difficult to escape the conviction that the Letter of Aristeas is primarily an apologia for Judaism and its way of life founded in the Law".

[4] Cf. also Brock (1992:306–308), who reconstructs the process through which the writing of B.Ar. came about.

[5] Cf. the epoch-making monograph by Barthélemy (1963).

tains that what we have here in essence is "a blend of Greek form and Jewish content", which could be seen as a kind of manifesto of "Jewish Greekness" (Honigman 2003:19). Honigman is convinced that B.Ar. does not have a fundamentally polemical intent, even though she admits that in the apology for the Law there are some polemics contra philosophical viewpoints (Honigman 2003:21). However, according to her the thrust of the treatise is not apologetic but rather "a multifaceted presentation of Judaism" (Honigman 2003:14). This is indeed a novel perspective, since the whole of B.Ar. is not interpreted exclusively from the perspective of the passage on the law of Moses.[6]

The author is convincing in her argumentation. Her holistic approach can certainly be deemed novel and timely. B.Ar. is after all a Greek writing for Graecised Jews in Alexandria. Therefore I think she is correct in calling for a cessation of the application of the term 'Judaeo-Hellenistic' and replacing it simply with the term 'Alexandrian literature' (Honigman 2003:147). The precarious position of the writing *vis-à-vis* its audience is evident in the description that is given of the law of Moses in B.Ar. The law is called the divine law (θεῖος νόμος) in §3. The God who gave them their law is the Lord and Creator of the Universe, who is called by different names, Zeus or Dis (§16). This law is moreover the law of the Jews (τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα §10).

B.Ar. is seemingly infused with Greek philosophical ideas. Hence in §15 the author talks about God as Zeus or Dis. However, it should be remembered that this statement is put in the mouth of a Greek, a non-Jew; it is not spoken by a Jew (Barclay 1996:143). Moreover, the Jewishness of the epistle is unmistakeably present. The law which is here referred to is, *inter alia*, the cultic laws of the Pentateuch. In §139 the following statements are made:

> περίφραξεν ἡμας ἀδιακόποις χάραξι καὶ σιδηροῖς τείχεσιν
>
> When therefore our lawgiver, equipped by God for insight into all things, has surveyed each particular, *he fenced us about with impregnable palisades and with walls of iron*, to the end that we should mingle in no way with any other nations, but remain pure in body and soul, free from all vain imaginations, worshipping the one Almighty God above the whole creation.

From §143 it is clear that the cultic laws are in fact referred to:

[6] Cf. Dines (2004:30) and Müller (1996:47).

> Therefore lest we should be corrupted by any abomination, or our lives be perverted by evil communications, *he hedged us round on all sides by rules of purity*, affecting alike what we eat, or drink, or touch, or hear or see.

Here we have an ancient exegetical tradition of the people of God being surrounded by the law in order to preserve them.

Thus the law referred to by Aristeas is the Law of Moses but more specifically the cultic, Levitical laws that have the function of hedging the Jews about in order to preserve them from 'un-Jewish' practices and beliefs. I have discovered a similar tradition of the law as surrounding wall in LXX Proverbs 28 verse 4, which I have interpreted as an indication of the position of a conservative Jewish translator (Cook 1999):

> עזבי תורה יהללו רשׁע ושׁמרי תורה יתגרו בם
>
> Those who forsake the law praise the wicked, but those who keep the law struggle against them.
>
> οὕτως οἱ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὸν νόμον ἐγκωμιάζουσιν ἀσέβειαν
> οἱ δὲ ἀγαπῶντες τὸν νόμον περιβάλλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς τεῖχος.
>
> Likewise those who forsake the law and praise impious deeds;
> However, those who love the law *build a wall around themselves*.

There seems to be no logical relationship between the LXX and the Hebrew (Cook 1999:461). It is, nevertheless, possible that the Hebrew reading **גור** was deliberately understood as **גדר** (wall). Be that as it may, here the law has a protective function towards the righteous. This is markedly different from the view found in some later rabbinical writings, for example the Mishna, and in even later rabbinical writings such as Aboth I,1, according to which the Torah must be protected. The latter says three things: be patient in justice, rear many disciples and *make a fence around the Torah*.

The passage in B.Ar. is an indication of the religious stance of its author. Even though he is willing to equate Adonai with Zeus or Dis, not directly however, and he deems the Greek philosophy an advantage, he nevertheless seems to stick to the Law of Moses and more specifically the Levitical laws to demonstrate his fundamental Jewishness. I think one could in this respect speak of a 'bottom line' of how far the author would be willing to go in advocating his religious stance. This has a direct bearing on the question of the extent to which Jews in the Diaspora were indeed Hellenised. Collins (2001:46) put it succinctly "There was a limit to Hellenisation, which is best expressed in the distinction between cult and culture". Jews were certainly Hellenised as

far as all aspects of culture are concerned, however, excluding the religion. It seems to me as if the author of B.Ar. was extremely accommodating towards Hellenism, which is understandable since he lived in Alexandria, but that as far as the religious sphere is concerned, he was reserved, as his view of the Law of Moses discussed above demonstrates. The second Alexandrian author, Aristobulus, has a somewhat different approach.

Aristobulus of Alexandria

Aristobulus is known as the first Jewish philosopher (Collins 1986:176). Collins (1986:177) and Barclay (1996:1) indeed regard him as the first "theologian of Hellenistic Judaism" (Collins 1986:177). Unfortunately we have only scant evidence of this controversial Jewish-Hellenistic, Alexandrian author, since only a few scattered fragments are extant for research purposes (Holladay 1995:43). He lived and worked in Alexandria in the first half of the second century BCE and wrote his treatise to Ptolemy VI Philometor (181–145 BC) circa 174–170 BCE.[7] His intention was to present a correct understanding of the Law of Moses. Dines (2004:33) regards this treatise as an apology "for the compatibility of Jewish faith and Greek philosophy".[8] Collins (1986:175) is in agreement, since he deals with Aristobulus under the rubric of Philosophical Judaism. Aristobulus was clearly influenced by Greek philosophy, even though he can be regarded as an eclectic (Hengel 1974:16, Walter 1983:12). Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. II 100, 3) regarded him as a "peripateticus."

Aristobulus refers to the Septuagint rarely, namely in fragment 3, where he mentions (like Philo of Alexandria) that the Greek philosophers actually got their insights from the Hebrew lawgiver (*PE* 8.10; ὁ νομοθέτης), Moses. The immediate context is the translation of the scriptures, the law and the prophets (τὰς γραφὰς τάς τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τὰς προφητικὰς—*Praeparatio Evangelica* 13.12) from Hebrew into Greek

[7] Cf. Walter (1964:41). Clement and Eusebius identify Aristobulus with the teacher of Ptolemy referred to in 2 Maccabees 1:10 (Collins 1986:175). Cf. also Holladay (1995:75).

[8] Cf. Hengel 1974:164. Cf. Also Barclay (1996:158): "This was not just a defensive move to make sense of 'outdated' narratives and laws. It was a positive strategy by which they attributed to Jewish 'philosophy' the insights of the Hellenistic civilization they admired."

during the reign of Ptolemy, son of Lagus, or Ptolemy Philadelphus. This immediately brings the relationship between Aristobulus and the B.Ar. into play. The three possibilities (Dines 2004:37) are: an independent use of traditions (Walter 1999:100); B.Ar. being dependent on Aristobulus; the converse. Collins (1986:176) accepts that Aristobulus seems to be prior to Pseudo-Aristeas, whereas Dines (2004:37) thinks Aristobulus is dependent on B.Ar.

Since the fragments of Aristobulus survive only in much later authors, it is rather difficult to decide this issue. However, it is clear that Aristobulus is not particularly interested in the LXX, except in the Law of Moses. In order to propose a correct understanding of the Law of Moses, he made a selection of passages from the Pentateuch which he interpreted allegorically and which represent an apology for the Torah.

As is the case with many Jewish-Hellenistic Alexandrian writings, Aristobulus' treatise is aimed at a Jewish and a gentile readership. Hence in the first place he addresses the king, and demonstrates the application of acceptable Hellenistic categories. In the second place, his specific interpretation is a challenge to more conservative Jews (*PE* 8.10.5), namely literalists who took the biblical text seriously (Collins 1986:179). The allegorical method naturally focuses on the hidden meaning of the text. There is a direct relationship between Moses, the 'lawgiver', and the law. Anatolius (H.E. 7.32) for one refers to the "exegetical commentaries" on the Law of Moses (βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωυσέως) that were written by Aristobulus. Other references are found in *PE* 8.10:

> In the book of the law (τῆς γραφῆς τοῦ νόμου), it is said that at the time when God was giving the law (ὁ νομοθεσίας), a divine descent unto the mountain took place, so that all might see the active power of God.

Sometimes he refers to the law code (ἡ νομοθεσία *PE* 8.10 and 12.1), a Greek word which is also used in order to describe "the entire law" (τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας) in *PE* 13.12.

It is therefore clear that the law referred to by Aristobulus is the law of Moses, which in some cases, as in *PE* 13.12., is a reference to the Pentateuch: "just as Moses in our LAWCODE has said that the entire beginning of the world was accomplished through God's words, for he invariably says in each instance 'And God spoke, and it came to be'"[9]

[9] This must surely be a reference to Genesis 1.

(Holladay 1995:162). In *PE* 13.12.5, he refers more specifically to the 10 commandments: "after receiving the teaching from God in statements on the TWO-TABLET LAW" (Holladay 1995:170).

When speculating about the creation, he seems to refer to Genesis 1 and Proverbs 8:22. He combines the resting of God on the seventh day and the creation of light on the first day with the pre-temporal being of wisdom (Proverbs 8:22), and certain philosophical notions (Hengel 1974:166). As is well-known, this speculation on the number seven is of Pythagorean origin and appears later in Philo of Alexandria as well. Aristobulus moreover quotes a number of Pentateuch passages probably from the Septuagint, such as Genesis 1 and 2. The statement (*PE* 13.12.3–8) "For it is necessary to understand the divine 'voice' not in the sense of spoken language but in the sense of creative acts, just as Moses in our law code has said that the entire beginning of the world was accomplished through God's words" and especially the final statement "For invariably he says in each instance, 'And God spoke, and it came to be' " are apparently quotations from the Genesis version. The phrase καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός, καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως occurs in LXX Genesis, although not in this specific form. I think there can be little doubt that this statement is based on the Septuagint.

The relationship with LXX Proverbs is less clear. The only possible point of contact between Aristobulus and this unit is his allegorical interpretation of chapter 8:22ff. in *PE* 13.12.40. This, however, has nothing to do with the Law of Moses in the restricted sense of the word. Aristobulus does refer to the law code in this regard: "Our law code has clearly shown us that the seventh day is an inherent law of nature."[10] Nevertheless, it does give us an insight into the way Aristobulus interpreted this text.

An important issue in this regard is the question as to which text Aristobulus used for his interpretation. Walter (1964:33) thinks that Aristobulus had the Greek text available. The passage he quotes from *PE* 13, 12, 11a (Mras 1956:33) is, however, not that evident:

> σαφέστερον δὲ καὶ κάλλιον τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων τις εἶπε Σολομῶν πρὸ οὐρανου καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχειν
>
> But more clearly and more beautifully one of our forefathers, Solomon, said that it (wisdom—JC) existed before heaven and earth. (Gifford 1903:721)

[10] Holladay (1995:185). Cf. also Winston (1981:36).

First, the Greek words used are quite different from those that appear in LXX Proverbs 8:22: Κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ. The reference to Solomon seems to be the only possible point of contact. However, this could certainly be an interpretation from memory and need not be seen as evidence of a quotation from the Septuagint. Moreover, it is possible that Aristobulus had knowledge of the Hebrew text, although Walter (1964:33) rejects this possibility. Second, the view that wisdom existed before the heaven and earth (creation) appears abundantly in rabbinic writings concerning the pre-existence of created things (Bowker 1969:100). In the final analysis therefore, these interpretations by Aristobulus give an insight into the way he in fact understood biblical themes, rather than bearing a direct textual witness to the extant biblical text. This is at least true of the text of Proverbs.

Another Alexandrian author who used the LXX and testifies to the existence of the Pentateuch is Demetrius, the chronographer, who probably lived in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy IV (Philopator 222–205 BCE, Holladay 1983:51). He is the earliest witness for a Greek version of the Pentateuch, and is thus an important source for determining the origins of the LXX and its impact upon Hellenistic Judaism in Alexandria. The problem is that he makes no reference to LXX Proverbs. In short, then, Aristobulus had a positive attitude towards Greek philosophy which agrees to some extent with B.Ar., but is totally different from the Septuagint, at least the LXX of Proverbs, as should become clear from the final section of this paper.

The Septuagint of Proverbs

I have demonstrated elsewhere that the Greek version of Proverbs is an intriguing and unique translation (Cook 1994; 1997; 1999; 2002). That the person(s) responsible for this unit was a creative interpreter can be observed on various levels. On the micro level (lexical issues), he applied a large number of *hapax legomena* and neologisms (Cook 2002). He also introduced variations in many instances and chose to be consistent in fewer instances. Therefore I have defined his lexical approach as one of *diversity* and *unity* (Cook 2001:208). On the micro level this translator also displays remarkable freedom. He deliberately removed references to Agur and Lemuel in Chapters 30 and 31 and adapted the order of some of the chapters from 24 through 31 (Cook, 'Greek of Proverbs').

This translator clearly had an excellent education in Greek and Jewish culture. However, contrary to Aristobulus he applied the knowledge he obtained only to the external *form* but he purposely refrained from applying Hellenistic ideas. LXX Proverbs even exhibits a fundamentally anti-Hellenistic attitude. The prominent role of the Mosaic Law in this unit attests that the translator felt the need to underline the value of the Law of Moses. The notion of the Law of Moses as a surrounding wall in chapter 28:4 is widespread in Judaism in earlier and in later contexts. In LXX Proverbs and Aristeas the law surrounds the righteous, whereas in the Damascus document and the Mishna the Torah is surrounded (Cook, 'Law and Wisdom', 339). In LXX Proverbs, the Law of Moses is actually underscored more explicitly than in the Hebrew version of Proverbs since this law was devalued in the Hellenistic environment in which these Proverbs came into being.[11] There are more examples of this anti-Hellenistic inclination. In chapters 9 and 13 the equivalent of the phrase "For to know the law is the sign of a good mind" has no equivalent in MT. Proverbs 9:10 reads:

תחלת חכמה יראת יהוה ודעת קדשים בינה

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the holy one is insight.

10 ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου
καὶ βουλὴ ἁγίων σύνεσις
[10a] τὸ γὰρ γνῶναι νόμον διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθῆς.

The beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord and the counsel of saints is understanding, for to know the law is the sign of a sound mind.

A slightly adapted phrase appears also in chapter 13:15 to underline the relevance of the law for its readers. Other examples of Jewish exegetical interpretation in Proverbs occur in 2:11 and 17:

11 βουλὴ καλὴ φυλάξει σε
ἔννοια δὲ ὁσία τηρήσει σε

Good counsel will guard you and holy intent will protect you

17 υἱέ μή σε καταλάβῃ κακὴ βουλὴ
ἡ ἀπολείπουσα διδασκαλίαν νεότητος
καὶ διαθήκην θείαν ἐπιλελησμένη

My son, do not let bad counsel overtake you, that which forsakes the teaching of youth and has forgotten the divine covenant.

[11] 1 Maccabees 1:14f. describes a comparable historical context.

This is a well-known rabbinic tradition concerning the **יצרים** (the good and evil inclinations) inherent in mankind.[12] These Judaic interpretations are an indication of the extent to which the translator(s) of Proverbs was a conservative Jewish thinker. In this regard Baumgartner (1890:253) has argued that the translator of Proverbs was deeply influenced by Jewish Midrash. Bertram (1936) also held the view that this unit represents Jewish legalism, contrary to Gerleman (1956:53) who thought that a Greek rather than a Jewish philosophical way of thinking is to be taken as the background to issues of religion and ethics in LXX Proverbs.[13]

There are other appropriate examples, one being the moralizing or religionising element present in LXX Proverbs (Cook 2004). Religionising is achieved by means of the addition of the positive (the translator adds references to *righteousness* consistently and systematically), by adding the negative (evil and unrighteousness as characteristics of religion abound in the explicative, exegetical renderings used by the translator) and by contrasting. The translator of LXX Proverbs made use of contrasts to a greater extent than is the case in the Hebrew text, a trait which defines the translation technique that has its roots in the ideology of the translator. This anti-Hellenistic tendency[14] stems from religiously conservative Jews who deliberately warned the readers of the dangers inherent to Hellenism.

Conclusion

These issues have implications for our understanding of the writings I have dealt with and more specifically with the dating and locating of LXX Proverbs. As I demonstrated above, there are clear signs of continuity and discontinuity between LXX Proverbs and the B.Ar. The well-known exegetical tradition of the Law of Moses surrounding the righteous occurs in both writings and could perhaps indicate a similar historical context. However, it is also possible that these traditions originated in Palestine and from there found their way to Egypt.

---

[12] Cf. my article 'The origin of the tradition of the **יצר הטוב** and **יצר הרע**' *Journal for the Study of Judaisme* 38 (2007), 80–91.

[13] Cf. also Hengel 1974:277.

[14] I agree with Nickelsburg (2003:152) that any author can at the same time be Jewish, anti-Hellenistic and Hellenistic.

There is a significant precedent in the Septuagint of Esther that in all probability came into existence in Palestine during the time of Alexander Jannaeus and was subsequently brought to Alexandria in order to introduce the Purim feast to the Jews (Bickerman 1944, 1950; and De Troyer 2001:398). However, the prominent differences between LXX Proverbs and B.Ar. may reflect different historical contexts. One significant difference is that LXX Proverbs is more anti-Hellenistically inclined that B.Ar. This is naturally to be expected, since the OG text is after all a scriptural unit.

As far as the second writing, Aristobulus, is concerned, there is no evidence in the Septuagint of Proverbs of the philosophical, allegorical speculations that occur in Aristobulus.[15] As a matter of fact, the person responsible for this translation held an anti-Greek philosophical perspective. In the light of this interpretation I conclude, contrary to D'Hamonville (2000:134), that Aristobulus could not have been the translator of LXX Proverbs.

[15] In my view this applies to LXX Genesis too. Cf. Cook (1998).

SEXUALITY AND PTOLEMY'S GREEK BIBLE: GENESIS 1–3 IN TRANSLATION '… THINGS WHICH THEY ALTERED FOR KING PTOLEMY' (GENESIS RABBAH 8.11)

William R.G. Loader

The 'King Ptolemy' referred to in this early fifth century rabbinic commentary on Genesis is Ptolemy II Philadelphus (reign: 283–46 B.C.E). 'The things which they altered for King Ptolemy' alludes to instances where the Greek translation differs from the acknowledged Hebrew text.[1] All translation is to some degree alteration, intended or otherwise. We have no access to the minds of ancient translators, let alone their intentions, so that at most we can describe the translated text and directions in which it points, including its alterations. Once translated, however, texts take on a life of their own, as they are read and re-read in new contexts and produce new meaning. This investigation explores the 'altered' texts, including possible influences which shaped them, and, above all, the potential meanings thus created.

The translation of the Torah, the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures, seems to have taken place in part in response to Ptolemy II Philadelphus. This chapter must forego discussion of the complex

[1] In rabbinic tradition the lists varies from 10 to 18 items. The particular instance to which *Genesis Rabbah* refers is Genesis 1:27, which in the Hebrew reads: 'Male and female he created them'. The lists allege a Greek form of the text which read: 'Male and female he created *him*.' In his discussion of this variant Emanuel Tov concludes that the Greek variant may already reflect a variant Hebrew text. Emanuel Tov, 'The rabbinic tradition concerning the 'alterations' inserted into the Greek translation of the Torah and their relation to the original text of the Septuagint,' in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (NovTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–20, esp. 11, 17–18. Whether in Hebrew or Greek, the presence of a singular, 'Let us make *adam*' in 1:26 might easily have attracted a change to a singular in 1:27, but we cannot rule out the possibility that androgynous understandings of the text (possible in Hebrew or in Greek) may have prompted the change. See also the discussion in G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 22–112, who argues against taking the instances as evidence of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Perhaps the original translators did alter the text for Ptolemy in this way. Outside of these discussions in the rabbinic Hebrew texts there is no manuscript evidence for the singular.

historical issues.[2] Instead it will focus on those formative chapters with which Torah begins, the account of creation and of human beginnings, and do so with a particular focus on the attitudes towards sexuality which are reflected in them. It will then explore possible influences on the translators of Plato's *Timaeus* and its attitudes towards sexuality.

Genesis and Plato's Timaeus on Creation

Genesis 1 and 2 contain two different accounts of creation, widely believed to reflect two different mythological traditions and coming from different sources, P and J. In the first, 1:1–2:4, creation takes place over six days, with God resting on the seventh. The climax of creation is the creation of humankind (*adam*) 'male and female' (1:27). In 2:5–24, however, we have a different sequence. God forms a human being (a man, *adam*) from the dust of the ground (*adamah*), a Hebrew word play (an earthling from earth), and then proceeds to create plants and animals for him and finally woman to be his companion.

There is evidence that the Greek translators were sensitive to the issues of the two stories, at least to the extent that they added some elements to the text which smoothed the differences. The apparent second creation of plants and animals now becomes the emergence of what had been created but had not yet come into being. Similarly the creation of man and woman of 1:27 now finds its elaboration in 2:18–25. The background assumption is that what was made according to the first story comes to concrete expression in the second.

The translation achieved this with only slight modifications. It added 'began' (ἤρξατο) into 2:3 which reads in Hebrew, 'So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it God rested from all the work that he had created to make (וּבוֹ שַׁבַּת מִכָּל־מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת)'. In Greek it now reads: 'So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it God rested from all the works that he had *begun to* make (ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι)'. God's rest on the seventh day does not imply the task had been completed. The addition also forms a neat formal *inclusio* with the opening verse of Genesis: 'In the beginning' (ἐν ἀρχῇ).[3] In a sense 1:1–2:4 is the beginning of creation for the LXX.

[2] See the appendix below.

[3] So J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars,

Similarly the translation of 2:4 represents 'these are the generations' (אֵלֶּה תוֹלְדוֹת) by 'this is the book of the origin/becoming' (αὕτη ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως—hence the book's subsequent name γένεσις) and emphasises the word 'becoming' (γίνομαι) in what follows. The explicit addition of ἔτι (still, yet) in 2:9 and in 2:19 helps strengthen the sense of continuation of creation between Genesis 1 and 2. God is still creating.

In his treatment of the Septuagint translation of Genesis 1–11 Martin Rösel recognizes a framework which might have helped the translators or, at least their hearers, to understand the relationship between the two creation stories.[4] He notes possible influence from Platonic thought, and the *Timaeus* in particular,[5] which also dealt with creation. Both Genesis and the *Timaeus*, he points out, contain two accounts of creation. The two accounts in each share a common order in describing the events: heavenly bodies (1:6–8/33Bff), stars and time (1:14–19/38Bff), sea creatures, birds and animals (1:20–25/40A), humankind (1:26–28/41D ff.); and beginning afresh: the formation of the human being (2:7/69Aff), mention of plants (2:8/77Aff) and concluding with formation of animals (2:18–20/91Aff).[6] In both the creator[7] assesses his work as very good (1:31/37C), before resting (2:3/42E).[8] The *Timaeus* assumes the creation of the invisible world of forms before the creation of the visible. The notion of an invisible heavenly world was not totally

---

1993) 21; W.P. Brown, *The Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3* (SBLDS 132; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) 26.

[4] M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 72–87.

[5] On earlier discussions of the similarities and differences see J. Pelikan, *What has Athens to Do with Jerusalem?* Timaeus *and* Genesis *in Counterpoint* (Jerome Lectures, 21; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Pr., 1997) 26, 46–47. 'Whether they came directly from the Timaeus to the translators of the Septuagint or not, the words, *genesis*, *arche*, and *kosmos*, moreover, were (along with many others to be noted later) only three of the elements of elective affinity evident already in the Greek vocabularies of Genesis and of Timaeus that would be deserving of comparative study in their own right' (26).

[6] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 81.

[7] Exodus 3:14 LXX renders the words, 'I am who I am' אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה by ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν 'I am the one who is/exists'. The related name, Yahweh, however, which begins to appear in Genesis 2:4 and might be translated 'The one who is/becomes', is overlooked in LXX until 2:8 and then rendered in the LXX: ὁ κύριος, 'Lord', which puts the focus inherently on power and rule, an aspect not inherent in the Hebrew éäää. On this see Armin Schmitt, 'Interpretation der Genesis aus hellenistischem Geist,' *ZAW* 86 (1974): 137–163, here 160–161. A translator wanting to echo the *Timaeus* would have done well to translate with ὁ ὤν, but one must assume established usage in the choice of ὁ κύριος. See also Pelikan, *Athens?* 34.

[8] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 81.

foreign to Jewish thought, nor was the notion of a mediator of creation in the person of wisdom.[9] There are sufficient common elements for a Jewish translator, let alone a Jewish hearer, to have brought the thought and the language of the *Timaeus* into relation to the Genesis account.

The words used for create and form, namely ποιέω for בָּרָא, and πλάσσω for יָצַר, may well be explicable in the light of the *Timaeus*. While πλάσσω appropriately translates יָצַר, the choice of ποιέω for בָּרָא is striking. The LXX of the Pentateuch uses standard equivalents in translation. Ποιέω is the standard equivalent translation in the LXX for עָשָׂה 'to make'. For בָּרָא one would expect κτίζω, the word for 'create', appropriately favored by later Greek translations.[10] The choice appears to reflect influence from elsewhere. The use of these verbs for the work of the maker and of the gods in the *Timaeus* provides a possible explanation.[11]

Other related terminology also includes ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος 'invisible and not properly made' in Genesis 1:2, matching the contrast in the *Timaeus* between the invisible model,[12] on the one hand, and the material, on the other, although in the latter case unformed.[13] The Hebrew words mean: 'without form and void'. Accordingly Genesis 1:1–2 LXX function as a summary title for what follows,[14] and could be understood as the creation of the noetic, as in Philo under the influence of the *Timaeus*.[15]

---

[9] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 82. Rösel points to the interpretations of בְּרֵאשִׁית in an instrumental sense behind Proverbs 8:22–26 and Job 28:25–27, so that like the Maker in the *Timaeus* 24BC, God created the world through wisdom identified as רֵאשִׁית.

[10] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 29–30, 60; Pelikan, *Athens?* 48.

[11] J. Cook, 'Greek Philosophy and the Septuagint,' *JNSL* 24 (1998) 177–191, urges caution (178–181).

[12] For ἀόρατος in the context of Plato's invisible world see *Timaeus* 36C, 46E.

[13] So Rösel, *Übersetzung* 31–33, who reads ἀκατασκεύαστος in the context of creation of order from what is not yet formed expressed in *Timaeus* 30A (εἰς τάξιν αὐτὸ ἤγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας); Pelikan, *Athens?*, 51; Schmitt, 'Interpretation', 150–151.

[14] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 35.

[15] Philo treats day one (Gen 1:1–5) distinctively as the creation of the world of ideas (*Opif.* 15–16). On this see D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Philo of Alexandria Comm. Ser. 1; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 132–135. See also his major treatment of the extensive influence of the *Timaeus* on Philo, to the extent of direct citation of it, in his writings and even his attributing its insights to Moses: D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato* (Phil Ant 44; Leiden: Brill, 1986), and on creation, in particular, see 92–94. See also R.A. Baer, *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female* (ALGHJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970), and Brown, *Structure*, 31–35.

The *Timaeus* also attributes motivation to the maker. The maker is good (καλός) and what is made is good (*Timaeus* 29A, 87C, 92C).[16] LXX uses the same word to translate the expression 'and God saw that it was good' (1:25). The unusual choice of στερέωμα, not previously used of heavenly bodies, to translate רָקִיעַ 'firmament' in 1:6, is only to be explained according to Rösel on the basis of the use of στερεός in the *Timaeus*, meaning, 'firm, solid', and referring to heavenly bodies.[17] Other alleged influences are to be found in the use of γένος 'kind' and ὁμοιότης 'likeness', the latter with no Hebrew equivalent in the surviving texts in 1:11 and 12. It appears to assume creation also of plant life in likeness to its model, as in the *Timaeus* and under the influence of 1:26.[18]

The translation of 'every living creature that moves' (נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְמִינָהּ) by πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζῴων ἑρπετῶν 'every soul of moving beings' (1:21) opened possible connections with the creation of souls in *Timaeus* 41D–42E. The unusual τετράποδος ('four footed') for 'cattle' (בְּהֵמָה) in 1:24, reflects the language of *Timaeus* 92A. To these Rösel adds εἰκών in 1:26–27; 5:1,3 (see also ἰδέα in 5:2–3), κόσμος in 2:1;[19] συντελέω in 2:2 (cf. *Timaeus* 92C) and the use noted above of γένεσις 'becoming' as the standard equivalent of תּוֹלְדוֹת, in 2:4 and 5:1,[20] and the striking prominence of the verb γίνομαι 'to become' in 2:4–5, including the translation of 'when he created' (בְּהִבָּרְאָם) by 'when it became' (ὅτε ἐγένετο) in 2:4, all echoing the Platonic distinction between being and becoming articulated in *Timaeus* 27C–29D.[21] Sim-

[16] Pelikan, *Athens?*, 42. See also Schmitt, 'Interpretation', 151–152 who draws attention to the shift which this achieves from functionality and beauty to primarily beauty and connects it also with the translation of צָבָא by κόσμος in 2:1.

[17] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 36, 82. He refers to *Timaeus* 31B, 43C. The notion of a dome might also have recalled the creation as a sphere in the *Timaeus* 33B (σφαιροειδές), as Pelikan, *Athens?*, notes (50).

[18] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 43.

[19] וַיְכֻלּוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל־צְבָאָם LXX: καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν. See also Schmitt, 'Interpretation,' on the coherence between the use of κόσμος to translate צָבָא and the earlier use of καλός (152).

[20] Of Philo's interpretation of γένεσις in the context of the influence of the *Timaeus* Runia, Timaeus *of Plato*, 94 writes: 'The Platonic doctrine allows one to understand the Mosaic title, but at the same time the Mosaic title validates the Platonic doctrine'. See also pp. 426–433 and his *On the Creation*, 119.

[21] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 57–59. Pelikan, *Athens?*, 56. He adds: both *Timaeus* and Genesis have the sequence night then day (53) and use sun and moon for measurements and have stars as secondary (54).

ilarly the 'still' ἔτι in 2:9 and 2:19 makes good sense within a Platonic framework.[22]

Accordingly Rösel suggests that the translation is now informed by a Platonic framework according to which the first creation story describes the creation of ideas, the second, the creation of the real. Certainly this is similar to the way Philo read it, as he expounded Genesis using the *Timaeus*. Rösel argues that such an influence of the *Timaeus* on the translators of Genesis is plausible, noting the arrival earlier of Demetrius of Phaleron in Alexandria.[23] The Peripatetic School had its own interest in laws of foreign states and was influential in Alexandria. Knowledge of Plato and of Hellenistic literary forms is reflected early and substantially in the writings of Alexandrian Jews. It gave rise to the bizarre claim of Aristobulus mid second century BCE, and others, that Plato (in all likelihood with reference to the *Timaeus*)[24] depended on Moses (fr. 3 and 4).[25] The strong influence of Hellenistic literary forms reflected in Jewish writings produced subsequently in Alexandria is evident already in the third century in the history by Demetrius, and in the second, in the histories by Artapanus and Aristeas, in the Pseudo-Orphic fragment and Pseudo Greek Epic poets quoted in Aristobulus, in Philo, the Epic poet, and, not least, in the composition of a tragedy by Ezekiel.[26]

---

[22] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 62–63. But see also Cook, 'Greek Philosophy', 180, who notes it does not require that context.

[23] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 83–84. On this see the discussion in the appendix below. He speculates Demetrius, who had been a student of the Academy at the time of the writing of the *Timaeus* and a prominent member of the Peripatetic School where Aristotle had taken the *Timaeus* to task, could easily have brought it with him on exile late in the fourth century or early in the third (83–84). Others of that school could also have been the conduit. This need not imply that translators had read the *Timaeus*. Rösel contemplates that they may have known its thought and language from anthologies (84). Cf. F. Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9; Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2001) 32, who cautions against the assumption that the LXX translators stood under the influence of the growing interest in Greek philology in Alexandria, for which he sees no evidence.

[24] So M. Hengel, *Hellenism and Judaism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols; London: SCM, 1974) 165. See also Runia, *Timaeus of Plato*, who comments on the minimal influence from the *Timaeus* detectable in Aristobulus (103, 410).

[25] On this and claims in similar authors see C.R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Volume III: Aristobulus* (SBLTT 39; Pseudepigrapha Series 13; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995). 207–209 n. 36.

[26] See the collation of literary and non literary texts in G.E. Sterling, 'Judaism between Jerusalem and Alexandria,' in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Christianity and

There are, however, significant differences between Greek Genesis and the *Timaeus*. The latter is a much more extensive text with much detail without any parallel in Genesis (for instance, discussion of the four elements, the notion of the sphere as a living being and 'God', the Pythagorean arithmetic and geometry—though the seven days are evocative; the transmigration of souls; the mother-receptacle). The point of the comparison is not however the differences, but that there is sufficient similarity in substance and terminology for a potential translator or hearer of Genesis to connect the two and so hear the one in terms of the other. We certainly know the latter occurred. Philo is our prime example. The points of similarity extend, as we shall see, beyond the initial creation to include involvement of others in creating humankind, the creation of woman from man and resultant problems related to sexuality. It is much more than simply the occurrence of terminology. The potential for such influence is independent of the issues of the extent to which the figure, Timaeus, expresses Plato's views, as already Aristotle assumed,[27] but which many dispute,[28] is

Judaism in Antiquity Series 13; ed. J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 265–301, 288–290; and on literary influence N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 64. This assumes knowledge of the literature itself, so that Aristeas's claim (121), that translators had some familiarity with Greek literature, is credible. Some knowledge of the *Timaeus* as a whole at some point is very likely to the point of recognizing similarity.

[27] So K.L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Pr., 2003) 24–25; D.J. Zeyl, *Plato: Timaeus* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000) xv, xxvi; Earlier F.M. Cornford; *Plato's Cosmology* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1937); F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy: Volume 1: Greece and Rome; Part 1* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1962), who writes: 'The theories of Timaeus are Plato's own, whether borrowed or not' (272). But they are only a 'likely account' not meant to be scientific (272). Zeyl also provides a critical review of the challenge to the placing of the Timaeus among Plato's later works (xvi–xx). See the review of approaches to the *Timaeus* down to Proclus in Runia, Timaeus *of Plato*, 38–57.

[28] The major challenge is that of A.E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (Oxford: OUP, 1928), 1–3 and *passim*. 'It is a mistake to look in the Timaeus for any revelation of the distinctively Platonic doctrines' (11). Note the comment of P. Kalkavage (ed.) *Plato's Timaeus: Translation, Glossary, Appendices and Introductory Essay* (Newburyport: Focus, 2001): 'What seems to make this art all the more deceptive is that we, along with Socrates, are being enjoined to suspend inquiry into first principles: we must 'receive the likely story about these things' and not 'search further for anything beyond it' (29D)' (43). Kalkavage takes the former line and depicts *Timaeus* as a drama designed by Plato to help people examine their own souls and to wonder at the connection between cosmic and political order (4); similarly G.A. Press, 'Plato,' in *The Columbia History of Philosophy* (ed. R.H. Popkin; New York: MJF Books, 1999) 32–52. Plato is being playful;

offering a literal (so Aristotle) or metaphorical account of creation, as his successors in the Academy (Speusippus and Xenocrates) assumed,[29] and the fact that the context of the *Timaeus* is preparatory for a discussion about the state.[30] There is little doubt in my mind that both Aristophanes' speech in the *Symposium* (189–193) and Timaeus' account of the origins of sexuality in *Timaeus* 91 reflect Plato's playfulness with characters,[31] but authorial intent and actual reader response can be worlds apart.

It is plausible that a translator familiar either with the *Timaeus* or with its language might bring this knowledge to bear on his translation. We may not be able to discern how much this was incidental and how much it was intentional—for instance, to underline a claim of authority for his text in the Hellenistic world. We are not, of course, dealing with a fresh account of creation from a Genesis perspective, as in Philo, but with a translation where the substance and sequence are dictated by the existing Hebrew source. There was sufficient substantial similarity with the *Timaeus* for the connection to be made. This includes not only the twofold account and the broad coincidence of the sequence of creation in each, but also common motifs such as eating the fruit of the tree, the fate of the snake, and the anxiety of the gods about human immortality. The correspondences in structure and motif are not in such detail that some theory of dependence is required, such we find in the propaganda of Aristobulus, who claimed that Plato and the Greeks learned the best of what they know from the Jews and so from an earlier Greek translation of the Genesis creation story. One should not rule out that both draw on some common mythologies.[32] But we are not dealing with a causal connection from Hebrew or from a pre-LXX Greek Genesis

---

Timaeus is a Pythagorean and Socrates largely just listens, so we can't take it as Plato's cosmology.

[29] See the discussion Zeyl, *Plato: Timaeus*, xxii–xxv. Aristotle understood it literally, but already in his time Xenocrates understood it metaphorically. If we assume a Peripatetic influence in the reading of the *Timaeus* in Alexandria, then it is likely that the literal interpretation would have been the dominant one there at the time when any potential translator became familiar with the work.

[30] Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 80; Copleston, *History of Philosophy* 1: 271.

[31] Taylor, *Plato's Timaeus*, notes: 'It is not likely that any part of the story was regarded by Plato himself as more than a parable.' *Laws* 904E 4 suggests lots in reincarnation are based on moral levels, not gendered (262).

[32] When the *Timaeus* begins, for instance, with hints of accessing ancient wisdom through Solon from Egypt, might that imply in some roundabout way knowledge of the Jewish creation myth?

to Plato, but at most with sufficient similarity of theme and structure to lead people to think of the two accounts together and so in the case of a translator or hearer of the Greek account to allow the reading of the latter to stand under the influence of the *Timaeus*.

Changes in Genesis 1–3 LXX Relating to Sexuality

In this section I want to review three main passages within Genesis 1–3 which pertain to human sexuality. I have treated these and related passages in detail in my recent book, *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament*, where I also consider the way in which the translation has had an impact on both Philo and some writers of the New Testament.[33] My purpose here is to present these findings briefly in order to bring them to bear on a comparison with the *Timaeus*.

Genesis 1:26–28 (and 5:1–3)

Genesis 1:26–28 describes the creation of humankind. Changes here are minor but potentially significant. In 1:26 'in our image according to our likeness' (בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ) becomes 'according to our image and according to our likeness' (κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν).[34] The double κατά ('according to') construction produces an echo of ('according to [its] kind') of the preceding verses, giving the impression more strongly than in the Hebrew that humankind belongs to the γένος of God, in contrast to the animals. The word for 'image' εἰκών might reflect or evoke Platonic associations.

'Let us make' (נַעֲשֶׂה; ποιήσωμεν) might recall the gods in the *Timaeus* being entrusted with making people (*Timaeus* 41 BC). 'So God created humankind (אֶת־הָאָדָם) in his image, in the image of God he created him' becomes: 'So God made humankind (τὸν ἄνθρωπον), in the image of God (κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ) he made him.' The unusual shift from 'create' (בָּרָא) to 'make' (ποιέω) may reflect the language of the *Timaeus*. Similarly in 1:27 'male and female he *created* (בָּרָא) them' becomes 'male and female he *made* (ἐποίησεν) them'.

---

[33] W. Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 27–59.

[34] Καὶ may not be an addition but reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, which would match the Samaritan Pentateuch and Vulgate.

The LXX faced a problem with the Hebrew word *adam*.[35] In 2:7 it was not able to reproduce the word play between *adam* (אָדָם) and *adamah* (אֲדָמָה), which produces an image of the human being as earthling. So the translators needed to make decisions about when to use the generic ἄνθρωπος 'human being' and when to use what for them is the proper name of a male, Adam. The inevitable consequence is that the hearer familiar with the LXX version is inevitably led to see a reference to the man, Adam, from the beginning, even when the generic term is used, even though the first occurrence in the LXX of the name, Adam, occurs in 2:16. Although the translators must have been aware of the generic sense (as 5:1 shows), their inability to reproduce the ambiguity of the word *adam*, inevitably put greater focus on the first man as male.

Both the Hebrew and Greek texts are open to a wide range of interpretations. These include seeing in 1:27 a report of the creation of bisexual human beings,[36] or of generic humankind as including males and females,[37] or of the man from whom then the female is formed in chapter 2, the more likely reading of the Greek account. Genesis 1:26–27 find their echo in 5:1–3. The Hebrew of 5:1 recalls the creation of *adam* (humankind or Adam). The LXX is unambiguous: 'When God created Adam' (ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Αδαμ). The Hebrew continues by reporting: 'in the likeness (בִּדְמוּת) of God he made him'. LXX modifies to: 'in the image (κατ' εἰκόνα) of God he made him', reflecting the use of 'image' (בְּצַלְמוֹ) twice in 1:27 and also in 1:26,

[35] See my detailed discussion in *Septuagint*, 32–35.

[36] Reading Genesis 1:27 as bisexual J.C. de Moor, 'The duality in God and Man: Gen 1:26–27,' in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel: Papers read at the tenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en Belgie, held at Oxford, 1977* (OTS XL; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 112–125, 124; P. Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978) 17–23 (bisexual or, better, asexual). Cf. E. Noort, 'The creation of man and woman in biblical and ancient near eastern traditions' in *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* ed. G.P. Luttikhuizen (Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions I; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 1–18, who notes that P does not assume equality elsewhere and argues that the male-female differentiation serves the promise of progeny, as in 5:1–3 (6–10).

[37] For the view that the Hebrew text assumes man and woman emerge only after the separation in 2:23 see M. Bal, *Lethal Love: Feminist Literary Readings of Biblical Love Stories* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Pr., 1987) 113–116; Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, 17–21, 97–98 and against this: F. Watson, 'Strategies of recovery and resistance: Hermeneutical Reflections on Genesis 1–3 and its Pauline Reception,' *JSNT* 45 (1992) 79–103, 92–93; B.J. Stratton, *Out of Eden: Rhetoric and Ideology in Genesis 2–3* (JSOTSup 208; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 102–103.

possibly preferring the more philosophical connotations of εἰκών. 'Male and female he created them (בְּרָאָם)' 5:2 becomes 'male and female he made them (ἐποίησεν αὐτούς)', as in 1:27a. In the concluding line of 5:2, 'and he named their name *adam* (humankind or Adam)', LXX is again unambiguous: 'and he named their name Adam' (Αδαμ). This reinforces the view that in the LXX God made Adam, a man, in 1:27 and would subsequently make woman from him, but that in a sense he already incorporated male and female, whereas the Hebrew *adam* allows a more generic understanding. Within the context of what follows the one created would very naturally be identified with the man formed from the dust of the ground in 2:7, whose name we learn is Adam. 1:26–28 accordingly finds its elucidation in 2:7–25. There we see the return of the theme of maleness and femaleness. Read within a Platonic framework we might see, at least, in 1:26–27 and 5:1–2, the creation of the human archetype, or, at least, the rational soul.

If we stay with the terminology of the *Timaeus*, we may note that while εἰκών ('image') and ὁμοιότης (likeness) echo its terminology, the model of which humankind is the εἰκών in Genesis is not an eternal idea or 'pattern' (παράδειγμα), but God himself.[38] The difference between the maker's creating the cosmos according to eternal patterns and God's creating humankind in his own image is not as great as may seem, however, especially if we take into account that *Timaeus* assumes that the maker used as a model the eternal which is good (which is why this cosmos is also good/beautiful). It then connects this with God's own being: 'He was good, and in him that is good no envy ever arises concerning anything; and being devoid of envy he desired that all should be, so far as possible, like himself' (29E). This then informs the maker's method, including the implanting of a soul in the cosmos: a 'Living Creature endowed with soul and reason owing to the providence of God' (30B), which could also be called a god (34B). Such a thought seems far from Judaism, but it might be argued that it is still very close to the notion of creation in God's image.

There is a further oddity about the account in the *Timaeus*. It depicts four forms existing within the Living Creature, gods of the heavenly kind, birds, fish, and land animals (*Timaeus* 39E 40A). The gods are immortal. The rest are not, but they are required to come into being for the sake of completeness. They must not be immortal, so the maker

[38] Philo sees 1:26 as referring to the heavenly man, the model, in turn, for the forming of human beings to be related in Genesis 2. See Loader, *Septuagint*, 60–61.

declares: 'But if by my doing these creatures came into existence and partook of life, they would be made equal to gods' (41C). The envy of the gods is a motif also present in the Genesis myth (3:22). 'Then the LORD God said, "See, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever".' Genesis has its own story about human mortality resulting from human disobedience, but even there we find what many would doubtless hear as an echo of the maker's anxiety that humans might 'be made equal to gods'.[39] Banishment from the garden averts the threat. For the *Timaeus* the soul is, indeed, immortal, but fails to reach immortal bliss also through human disobedience.

The created gods then receive the commission to create the other kinds. One might expect an account of the creation of the three forms, but instead we have the creation of humankind. Later we will learn that they, themselves, will indirectly generate the others through their failures. The description of humankind as a kind of microcosm of the cosmos, carrying the sphere upon its skeletal structure (*Timaeus* 44D) further reinforces the notion that like the cosmos so the microcosm is in some sense in the image of its maker.[40] The souls of men derive from the mixing bowl from which the gods, too, came, but now with impurities (41D). They attach themselves each one to a star, all equally learn the nature of the Universe, and the laws of destiny. They are on this basis 'to grow into the most god-fearing of living creatures [42A]' and so return to their star from their embodiment.

The other fascinating connection with the *Timaeus* is the plural, 'Let us make' in 1:26. For those familiar with the *Timaeus* it might evoke the plural gods who act as agents of creation in the *Timaeus*, primarily in making humankind, male and female.[41] Genesis, however, assumes the 'we' includes God, the creator. This did not stop Philo, for instance, drawing attention to the involvement of others and attributing to their role the flawed creation of humankind, and by implication, also women.[42] The 'we' in Genesis need not imply something inferior bereft of immortality as in the *Timaeus*. Nor does Genesis suggest impurities in the creation of humankind.

---

[39] Pelikan, *Athens?*, 62–63—also a decision by God and not just human disobedience.
[40] Pelikan, *Athens?*, 56.
[41] Pelikan, *Athens?*, 56–57.
[42] *Opif.* 75; see also *Fug.* 68–70. And see Runia, *Timaeus of Plato*, 242–249.

Genesis 2:18–25

The translation of 2:18–25 appears to stand under the influence of the translation of 1:26–27. Intentionally or otherwise the translator opens the possibility much more strongly than in the Hebrew that people would hear the formation of the woman as matching the creation of the man in such a way that as man is in the image of God, so woman is in the image of man. According to Genesis 2:18, God declares that it is not good for the man to be alone. God's initiative is to find a companion for him. The man has already born the name, Adam, in 2:16 so that in the LXX, the man of 2:18, while depicted generically as ἄνθρωπος, is nevertheless, more strongly than in the Hebrew, the male man, Adam. The first initiative fails—but it is the formation from the ground 'of every animal of the field and every bird of the air' and the man gives them all names. The second initiative succeeds: God forms the woman, whom the man also names. In both initiatives, in 2:18 and 2:20, we find עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, meaning: 'a helper according to what is before him' (i.e. his counterpart). In 2:18 LXX renders this as βοηθὸν κατ' αὐτόν 'a helper according to him, like him'. The same Hebrew words in 2:20, however, are rendered differently by the translators as βοηθὸς ὅμοιος αὐτῷ 'a helper like him'. The words ὅμοιος αὐτῷ appear stronger and recall the double κατὰ phrases of 1:26, where ὁμοίωσιν is used to describe the relation between man and God, inevitably understood as the man, Adam.[43] Other echoes of 1:26–27 include the change in 2:18 of 'I shall make' (אֶעֱשֶׂה) to 'Let us make' (ποιήσωμεν), and the unexpected generic (ἄνθρωπος) and not ἀνήρ for אִישׁ (man/male) in 2:24, when describing a man leaving his parents to be joined to his wife, all indicate the connection. Now within that frame of reference the naming of the woman, like the naming of the animals, is the act of a superior and her role as helper is likely to be seen as the role of an inferior (as in Philo *Q.G.* 1.26). A hierarchical understanding of Genesis 1–2 generally lies behind Philo and also Paul's discussion of men and women in 1 Corinthians 11.[44]

The overall effect of the LXX translation of 2:23–24 is also to produce a stronger affirmation than the Hebrew of the coming together of man and woman in sexual union, whereas the Hebrew emphases

[43] See my discussion in Loader, *Septuagint*, 99–104.
[44] See my discussion in Loader, *Septuagint*, 99–104.

more strongly common kinship.[45] According to the Hebrew of 2:23 the woman shall be called *ishshah* because she was taken from *ish*. The pun, like the *adam, adamah* pun, emphasizes commonality. Our English 'woman' and 'man' work to some degree, but all the LXX can do is: αὕτη κληθήσεται γυνή, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐλήμφθη she shall be called 'woman' (also meaning 'wife'), for she was taken out of 'her husband'—not very enlightening (unless we see some play here between γυνή and γεννάω, 'to give birth' as does Philo *QG.* 1.28). The emphasis therefore falls elsewhere than on the commonality. Adding 'her' to husband pre-empts what follows in 2:24, which now becomes the focal point and now more clearly than in the Hebrew describes marriage.

Where the Hebrew word focuses on becoming common kin (בְּשָׂר אֶחָד), one flesh or kin, 'like bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh' in 2:22, the Greek *sarx* carries more the connotation of physical union, and so emphasizes the aspect of sexual union more strongly. The Hebrew nevertheless also assumes this includes sexual union (an essential component in effecting marriage in Israel and surrounding cultures) and this may also be expressed in its active Qal verb דָּבַק (join to/stick to). The LXX translates this with the deponent passive προσκολληθήσεται (shall be joined/shall join). The deponent passive which will invite some, later, to read it as a real passive, rather than a deponent and hear Jesus' words, 'Whom God has yoked' accordingly. The presence in 2:24 of οἱ δύο (the two), not present in the Masoretic text (though reflected in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Vulgate and Peshitta) may also be seen as enhancing this sense of union.

The connections with 1:26–27, which are stronger than in the Hebrew, also invite the possibility that people might see such union as a reflex of an apparent unity of male and female in 1:27, especially if the man of 1:27 is understood to incorporate the female.[46]

There are a number of elements in 2:21–25 which invite further comparison with the *Timaeus*, not least its understanding of sexuality. Before considering these I want to look at one further passage in Genesis which bears on the theme.

---

[45] On this see Loader, *Septuagint*, 79–86.

[46] 2:25 LXX concludes, like the Hebrew, with the comment that the two of them were naked and were not ashamed, but unlike the Hebrew is unable to reproduce the pun with the craftiness of the snake עֲרוּמִּים 'naked'—עָרוּם 'crafty'.

Genesis 3:16–19 and 3:13

The final passage for consideration is Genesis 3:16–19. It reports God's curse on the snake, and punishment of the woman, and the man. More than in the Hebrew the LXX translation conveys a reversal of what occurred in the formation of man and woman. The man, formed from the earth returns to the earth and the woman formed from the man returns to the man. The Hebrew text reads:

> To the woman he said, I will greatly increase your pangs in childbearing;
> in pain you shall bring forth children,
> yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.

The LXX replaces 'desire' (תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ), which means sexual desire (as in Cant 7:11), with 'return' (ἀποστροφή).[47] Women will keep returning to their husband, by implication, seeking sexual intercourse, then falling pregnant over and over again and suffering the consequences. Their sexual desire is part of the punishment. 'Return' helps set up the notion of reversal of the process of formation and goes beyond what the Hebrew conveys. Both Hebrew and Greek see the punishment as also entailing the rule over women by their husbands. The word, 'return', ἀποστροφή, makes a connection for the hearer with the punishment of Adam: 'until you return to the earth ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν, from which you were taken' (3:19). Here, too, there are subtle differences. Hebrew has the word play: *adam* still potentially carries some generic sense and is more than a man's name, and so is translated, 'the man'. So *adam* 'earthling' returns to the *adamah* 'ground/earth', but then it uses עָפָר 'dust' as in 2:7, 'the dust of the ground'. For the LXX the pun *adam adamah* will not work. Instead LXX has God address Adam, the man, and simplifies the text using γῆ (earth) each time instead of ground and dust. The punishment is that he will toil for the earth and return to it: 'until you return to the earth, from which you were taken; because you are earth and to earth you shall return'.

---

[47] Ἡ ἀποστροφή can also mean, 'refuge', but the discussion which follows makes, 'return' more likely. On the translation see also Wevers, *Genesis*, who notes its translation by ἡ ἀποστροφή also in the related text Gen 4:7 which in Hebrew describes the passion of anger, also associated with the motif of rule, as 3:16 (55). The Greek appears not to refer to the return of sin to Cain as something he must master. Wevers sees no need to explain the unusual translation on the basis of reading תשובתך instead of תשוקתך (55), as proposed by R. Bergmeier, 'Zur Septuaginta-Übersetzung von Gen. 3:16' *ZAW* 79 (1967), 77–79.

More strongly than in the Hebrew the punishment for both the man and the woman is to return to where they came from (the earth, and the man, respectively) and be subordinated or to toil in hardship for them. For the woman this includes pain in childbirth into which she is continually being trapped by her keeping coming back to her husband sexually who in turn must control her. This is arguably present already to some degree in the Hebrew text, but it is enhanced in the LXX.

It raises, in particular, the issue of women's sexuality. What is the relationship between the subordination which now the LXX (though not the Hebrew) presupposes in 2:18–25 and the punishment of subordination in 3:16–19? What is the relation between the attitudes towards sexuality implied in 2:24 and 3:16–19? Is women's faultiness—their sexuality—a fruit only of the punishment or already the result of God's inferior co-creators, as Philo implies is reflected in the words: 'Let us make' (*Opif.* 72–75).[48] Or does the LXX translator appear to have seen a pattern in which women's sexual desire becomes their punishment and they need to be controlled by their husbands, as though before the punishment woman was simply a passive sexual partner when the man joins himself to her as the two become one flesh in 2:24? The matter is complicated for some by what occurs between 2:19–25 and 3:16–19, namely the events of the Garden of Eden.

The initiative of Adam and his wife to hide from God in 3:8 was probably not an expression of guilt but a reflection of their new found knowledge of 3:7 which told them that nakedness, especially of sexual parts, is inappropriate in the presence of the divine.[49] It need not imply that these sexual parts were evil, although it was and still is easy to confuse issues of purity and morality, and not without ground.

---

[48] On Philo's reading of ποιήσωμεν in 1:27 as explaining human flaws through engagement of other powers, see Runia, Timaeus *of Plato*, 242–249 and 265; also his *Philo: On Creation*, 236–243. Philo reads the plural also at 2:18 following the LXX and unlike the Hebrew (*Leg* 2.1, 5). While the former becomes the focus of his explanation of the origin of sin, it may also be implied for the latter, especially when women are made to represent the dangerous passions.

[49] See H. Wallace, *The Eden Narrative* (HSM 32; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), for the mythological background of the connection between nakedness and serpent and its likely sexual meaning in early forms of the myth (144–145). He also notes rabbinic tradition linking the names for the serpent and Eve, the possible origin of Eve in traditions about Asherah as the mother of all living and the links between the serpent and wisdom. The Genesis account is subverting existing myths, including a reduction of the sexual components and their use for etiology (148–162), although the notion of the earth's fertility remains in the Genesis story.

Confronted by God the woman declares in 3:13 'The snake tricked me, and I ate' (הַנָּחָשׁ הִשִּׁאַנִי וָאֹכֵל) rendered in the LXX as 'The snake deceived me and I ate' (ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέν με, καὶ ἔφαγον). The words ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέν με, can also be translated, 'The snake seduced me'. This is clearly how Paul (2Cor 11:2–3) read the passage.[50] Such a reading of the text, which is not required, but is possible, raises further questions about the woman's sexuality. Philo has no doubt, as we have seen. The woman is a flawed creature, the result of God not acting alone, and an element of that flaw is her sexuality. Other elements may reinforce this reading, including the enhanced description of the tree as enticing by its beauty, reminiscent of the dangers women were seen to pose to men). The *Timaeus* employs the image of plucking fruit from a tree for sexual intercourse, reflecting widespread usage (91D). Interestingly, the LXX begins in 2:16 with the singular in the permission for Adam to eat of all the trees, but changes the warning from singular to plural in 2:17 in the light of the story to follow in which the woman sins and leads Adam to sin. It puts the focus more strongly on the woman.[51]

The Timaeus and Genesis 1–3 LXX on Human Sexuality

The *Timaeus* states inequality between men and women up front, just after asserting equality in the relation to the soul's source and informed origin (41E): 'since human nature is two-fold, the superior (τὸ κρεῖττον) sex is that which hereafter should be designated "man"' (42A).[52] The female, nevertheless, belongs and is as much a part of intended creation by the maker through the gods as are birds, fish and animals. They are necessary to complete the cosmos. Genesis 1:27 offers no comment about the relative worth of male and female, although most people then and since will have read their patriarchal assumptions into the text.

According to the *Timaeus* the task of the human being, with both an embodied soul and an ensouled body which consists of passions and appetites, is to be victorious in the struggle against the latter and not let them rule. Success means eventual return to one's star and a life of bliss. 'But whoever falls to these will be transformed at his second birth into

---

[50] See Loader, *Septuagint*, 105.

[51] Pelikan, *Athens?*, 60–61.

[52] Taylor, *Plato's Timaeus*, points to *Rep* v 455D 2 according to which the best performance of women falls short of men in all departments (260).

the nature of woman' (42B) and failure thereafter produces a downward slide of reincarnations as lower forms of life until the trend is reversed. The *Timaeus* repeats this thought in greater detail in 91A. There we not only have a bizarre and amusing account of the degenerative process of men into women, then birds (those preoccupied with astronomy), animals (men who have given no attention to philosophy), and snakes (the most foolish of all). The process also brings to completion the act of creation, the realization of the Forms seen in the sphere. Aside from its striking (and perhaps intended) perversity, it repeats the assumption that female is inferior.[53]

In dealing with the realization of the female as failed male, it also expounds a theory of sexual attraction which implies that human sexuality is also a secondary adaptation. Those who knew Aristophanes' speech in Plato's *Symposium* (189C–193D) might have recalled the myth of the single human being combining male and female, then split into three types, each seeking its matching partner and thus explaining sexual attraction, of which the most noble is male seeking male. It required also a physical operation to relocate the genitals to the front side. The myth of androgyny may well lie behind the text known to the rabbis, alluded to in our title, which read: 'male and female he created *him*'.[54]

The *Timaeus* assumes sexual attraction to be the result of subsequent modification of the original generation of men (*Timaeus* 91). A hole, secondarily bored in the excretory organ, presumably by the gods, creates in males a channel for animate marrow (seed) to pass from the head down through the neck and spine into the penis which it turns into something wanting to reproduce and so develops a vibrant will to ejaculate. 'Wherefore in men the nature of the genital organs is disobedient and self-willed, like a creature that is deaf to reason, and it attempts to dominate all because of its frenzied lusts' (91C). Sexual

[53] Taylor, *Plato's Timaeus*, comments: 'It may fairly be doubted whether Timaeus himself is supposed to 'keep a straight face' to the end' (635). 'So, as to the first point, the alleged origin of sex, we can be sure that Plato is not in earnest with it, since he has put the same theory into the mouth of the comedian Aristophanes in the *Symposium* and has made Aristophanes introduce the tale with a reference to his own calling as a professional γελωτοποίος. Zeus according to this pretended cosmogony, split the original bi-sexual 'men' in half longitudinally, for fear of their storming Olympus, and if we continue to misbehave, he may repeat the operation and leave us to hop on one leg. It is quaint that earnest-minded dullards have found a profound 'metaphysic of sexual love' in this Rabelaisian jest. It is simply fun, admirably suited to the character of Aristophanes who utters it' (635). See also Runia, *Timaeus of Plato*, 346.

[54] See n. 1.

desire is an 'animate being within us' (ζῷον τὸ μὲν ἐν ἡμῖν) and expresses itself as an almost uncontrollable urge, verging on the demonic.[55]

Drawing on similar Hippocratic tradition, *Timaeus*' depiction is equally negative about women's sexuality. They have wombs that want to bear children and become sick and disruptive if left unfulfilled. They are not fulfilled 'until the desire (ἡ ἐπιθυμία) and love (ὁ ἔρως) of the two sexes unite them. Then, culling as it were the fruit from trees, they sow upon the womb, as upon ploughed soil, animalcules that are invisible for smallness and unshapen' (91CD). Yet we should be careful here to observe that while *Timaeus* envisages reality which has resulted from failure, within it there is now a role for sexual intercourse and that without it both women and men become unwell.[56]

There are significant similarities and differences here. Sexual union in Genesis is also connected with a physical operation, the making of woman from the original man; but neither the making of woman nor sexual intercourse is seen in a bad light in Genesis 2:20–25. Sexual union in Genesis does not appear to be driven by deficiency, the need to find the other half,[57] nor even by the need to produce children. On the contrary in part it rectifies a situation which was not good: 'It is not good for the man to be alone' (2:18).

In the *Timaeus* women also come from men, but there it is because of men's failure and the reincarnation of their souls in women. Sexual desire there is also a secondary adaptation (an operation). The *Timaeus* does not entertain the notion of oneness between man and woman, let alone marriage and family as a positive thing, as in Genesis 2:20–25 LXX. This coheres with the low view of family reflected in the words of Socrates in the beginning of the *Timaeus* 18C–E.

Genesis LXX, however, does appear to assume woman as inferior, especially by its translation of 2:18–25. While the motivation and process for the formation of the female is quite different, it is possible that someone coming from the *Timaeus* and its realm of influence might see the creation of woman in Genesis as the creation of an inferior. This

---

[55] On the passions as like wild animals see *Timaeus* 70E and *Rep* ix 588C 7.

[56] Gaca, *Fornication*, sexual renunciation as cause of ill health in women (*Timaeus* 91B7–17) and men (B 4–7) (40). Plato seeks in the *Republic* and *Laws* to change society so that it can overcome the dangers of sexual appetites which he saw ruining Athens and other cities. First priority was to regulate reproduction, taking away male possession of women through marriage which caused so much waste from unnecessary competition (41).

[57] Philo, *Opif.* 152 alludes to Aristophanes' myth.

appears to be implied in the structural analogy between the creation of man and the creation of woman in the LXX and so informs an understanding of 'helper' as a subordinate.

In addition it at least raises the possibility that Eve's fall was related to her sexuality, which, if so, casts a cloud over her sexuality from the beginning. The woman's initiative in responding to the snake, and then her punishment, result in an image of woman as a source of potential trouble. The LXX chooses to interpret the woman's constant returning to her husband as a punishment. This makes her sexual desire part of her punishment. It leaves open the possibility that the punishment exacerbates what was already a flaw. Now she is trapped into wanting sexual intercourse, falling pregnant, and suffering the pangs of childbirth. Consequently her uncontrollable sexuality needs controlling by a man.

We are now not far from the *Timaeus* in its treatment of sexual desire as an uncontrollable force within women. Unlike in the *Timaeus*, however, men's sexuality, affirmed in the sticking of oneself to one's wife and becoming one flesh, escapes the punishment. The LXX could, however, be read to imply that women only become sexually active as a result of the punishment, although a sexual understanding of the sin in the garden would suggest otherwise. The punishment of death for the man, return to the earth from which he was made, becomes for the woman, more clearly than in the Hebrew, the punishment of return to the man and to be controlled by the man—perhaps by analogy also a kind of death.

Good order in humanity in the light of Genesis 1–3 LXX is the family where man and woman become one flesh and the man controls his wife's sexuality (and by extension the sexuality of all other women, possibly including other wives, in his care) and she serves him as a helper. He is an image of God, as it were, for his family, and, joined to his wife, is fruitful and multiplies (fulfilling the command of 1:28). Good order according to Socrates' summary in *Timaeus* 18C–E, by contrast, is the control of women's sexuality through the guardians, and the production of children who are then brought up and educated by the community without attachment to or knowledge of particular parents.[58]

[58] Gaca, *Fornication*, 42. For the Republic 'the communal pooling of women and reproductive labor removes kinship-based factionalism and the related competition for wealth in the city' (45) freeing women from women's work (46); this is only for the elite (47). In the *Laws* Plato compromised, but then compensated by greater strictness:

They are to be made more like men. In the latter scheme there is room for women, and women are to be equally educated as souls who shared equally in the universe's secrets (41E).[59]

The *Timaeus* can also use the female image very positively to express the receptacle of becoming, using the image of the mother to express complex notions of space and time. In his description Timaeus speaks of the place of becoming as the receptacle, the nurse of becoming. The image is to that degree neutral, but it also incorporates the notion of the chaotic, perhaps reflecting an assumption about women's being (52DE).[60]

Female imagery also informs the structure of human being as shaped by the gods. As the women's quarters are separated from the men's in a house so in the human body the lower part beneath the midriff belongs to the appetites and animal passions which need the male values of courage and spirit, located closer to the reason of the citadel, the head, to control them (69E 70A).[61] Excessive pleasure—and Plato doubtless means sexual pleasure—is the disease of madness, which he expounds as overproduction of seed in the offending marrow. One might want to interpret this as solely a male thing and so homosexual, if Plato assumes this is a state where no females exist, but this is unlikely at this point.

---

an obligation to marry and have children (43, 48. 53); marriage must be strictly reproduction focused at first; no ejaculations without that as the goal; otherwise it is as bad as incest (54); no masturbating etc. Sexual intercourse is an art; temperance in it is enjoined because it affects offspring; they are affected by it being badly done—sober craftsmanship matters (55). Yet sexual activity for the male is not limited to marriage in Laws—one can also sleep with slaves, but only to get them pregnant (56). After the reproductive years there is not total restraint but moderation and discretion (57). So Plato does not limit sexual activity to procreation.

[59] On women's equal right to education in the Republic see E. Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1992) 58–59. Taylor, *Plato's Timaeus*, notes that *Timaeus*' views are closer to Aristotle in espousing women's inferiority, whereas Plato says the *aretê* of a man and of a woman is the same and so both should have the same education (636).

[60] 'The Nurse of Becoming, being liquefied and ignified and receiving also the forms of earth and of air, and submitting to all the other affections which accompany these, exhibits every variety of appearance; but owing to being filled with potencies that are neither similar nor balanced, in no part of herself is she equally balanced, but sways unevenly in every part, and is herself shaken by these forms and shakes them in turn as she is moved' (52DE).

[61] Zeyl, *Plato: Timaeus*, observes: 'The very existence of the mortal kind of soul and its susceptibility to the 'dreadful disturbances' of pleasure and pain and the violent emotions that afflict the organism is … due to Necessity' (lxxix). The Maker and then the gods had to work with material which entailed limitations as to what one could and could not do. This is an important aspect of the account of the creation in *Timaeus*.

Conclusion

If we assume Rösel's thesis, then a *prima facie* case exists for arguing that attitudes towards sexuality in the *Timaeus* may have already influenced the translation of Genesis. It is much easier to show such influence on subsequent readings of Genesis. The LXX Genesis texts now stand in their own right. They do have distinctive emphases which have been influential in understanding sexuality. Whether any of these distinctive emphases is to be explained by influence from the *Timaeus* is less certain. Patriarchy and negative views of women's sexuality were not confined to the *Timaeus*. There is significant coincidence in concepts and terminology, but with regard to the latter, not specifically in relation to attitudes towards sexuality in each. While the language of image and likeness probably reflects direct or indirect influence from the *Timaeus*, its impact in the translation of building the analogy between 2:18–25 an 1:26–27 moves beyond a Platonic framework. For it assumes an image of an image within realia. The derivation of woman from man is already there in the Hebrew text. At most one could say that the notion of superiority and inferiority coheres with what one finds in the *Timaeus*. The same is true of the suggestion of women's uncontrollable sexuality, although that, too, has its roots in part in the Hebrew myth. Clearly the *Timaeus* assumes a significantly different role for women in society, both as non familial and in their positive role. Nevertheless, it remains plausible that the shift in the LXX accounts towards a hierarchical understanding of God, man and woman, and towards a problematization of sexuality, including the possible sexualization of the garden myth, may be the result of a translator standing either directly or indirectly under the influence of the Timaeus or at least moving in circles where its language and such attitudes were at home. That the *Timaeus* thus exerted such influence also on the translation of passages relevant to sexual attitudes is, at least, to borrow from the *Timaeus*: 'a likely story'.

Appendix: The LXX and Ptolemy II

The translation of the Torah, the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures, seems to have taken place in part in response to Ptolemy II Philadelphus, like much else in the sphere of learning at the time in the Hellenistic enclave of Alexandria, where the son of Alexander's general,

Ptolemy, lived gloriously.[62] The evidence for a significant Jewish population in Alexandria at this time is strong. Jews will have come as prisoners of war after the taking of Jerusalem, as soldiers, or as settlers of their own free will eager to make a fresh start and escape the vicissitudes of Judea torn between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.[63] From sometime before the mid second century they organized themselves into a πολίτευμα (*Aristeas* 310), and according to Strabo had their own ethnarch (Jos. *Ant.* 14.117). By the first century CE Alexandria's Jewish population is estimated to have been roughly double that of Jerusalem.[64] The language of the translators belongs to Alexandria of the first half of the third century.[65]

Two independent second century BCE Hellenistic Jewish sources, Aristeas, a pseudograph from Alexandria, written in the second half to defend the translation, and Aristobulus, written in the first, identify Ptolemy's initiative together with Demetrius of Phaleron.[66] Both Diogenes Laertius (V 75–83) and Cicero (*Pro Rabirio Postumo* 9.23) contradict this partnership, reporting that Ptolemy banished Demetrius, who had advised against his succession, and had him killed. Their evidence goes alongside much else that is suspicious and clearly legendary in Aristeas.[67] It will have us believe, for instance, that seventy-two translators

---

[62] W. Orth, 'Ptolemaios II. und die Septuaginta-Übersetzung,' in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutiung der Griechischen Bibel* (ed. H.J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus; BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001) 97–114: speaks of the Ptolemies legitimizing their rule not by military might as Antigonus and his son Demetrius, not by appeal to divine support as Seleucus, nor by emphasizing closeness to Alexander as Lysimachus, but by cultivating the Alexandrian heritage by taking custody of his grave and making his city, Alexandria, magnificent. 'Dabei entschloss man sich, den Rang dieser Polis nicht in erster Linie auf Einwohnerzahl, bauliche Tracht und Wirtschaftsaktivität zu gründen, sondern auf Bildung und Wissenschaft' (103). On the unparalleled founding of the double institution of the Museum and Library see also P. Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Pr., 1990) 80–91.

[63] Orth, 'Ptolemaios,'101–102.

[64] Sterling, 'Judaism' 268.

[65] Orth, 'Ptolemaios' 97 n, 2. refers to P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford: OUP, 1972) 1: 689; 2: 956 n. 71. See also Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament*, 31, and Schmitt, 'Interpretation,' 144–149, who refers to legal and technical terms, designations of professions and geographical details.

[66] N. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (VTSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2000), argues that we should take into account two further witnesses who, she argues, are also independent: Epiphanius 48C, 51D, 52B and the twelfth century scholar, Johannes Tzetzes (60–61).

[67] Siegert, *Bibel*, dismisses Aristeas as just 'name dropping' (26). See also the negative assessment in J.M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004) 28–33. Contrast

were summoned from Jerusalem[68] and completed the task in senty-two days.[69] The 'seventy-two' trimmed to 'seventy' gives us the name of the translation: Septuaginta or Septuagint.

Whereas many scholars, dismissing Aristeas, attributed the translation, a most unusual undertaking in itself and without parallel in the Greek world for centuries,[70] to internal Jewish liturgical and didactic needs,[71] recently scholars have been more willing to give credence to the link with Ptolemy, indeed to his initiative.[72] They point to royal initiatives in translating demotic laws,[73] possibly also for reasons of informed

---

Collins, *Library*, who sets the date of the translation of the Pentateuch at 281 BCE, though most prefer a date around 250. She then argues that the translation would not have been necessary for the recent generation who emigrated, but clearly served royal purposes (115–181, esp. 176–178).

[68] This is not in itself unlikely given the sparse evidence for Aramaic or Hebrew in Alexandria. Probably only a limited number of people were bilingual: Siegert, *Bibel*, 26–27. Sterling, 'Judaism between Jerusalem and Alexandria,' points out 'there are only a handful of Semitic inscriptions' and that 'it is more like that they reflect periodic migrations of Jews from Judea' (273).

[69] Attested also in Jos. *Ant.* 12.11–119; Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* 2.25–44, whose story enhances the event into a miracle of 72 producing separate identical translations under the inspiration of the Spirit; and in rabbinic tradition: *b. Meg.* 9a–b; *y. Meg.* 1.1, 4. Elsewhere, in Christian circles, the legend warrants confidence in the Greek Bible. See M. Hengel, 'Die Septuaginta als 'christiche Schriftensammlung', ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem des Kanons,' in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. M. Hengel and A.M. Schwemer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994) 182–284, 184–209.

[70] Emphasised by Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 18; see also Siegert, *Bibel*, 24. He observes that the Romans conquered the east by mastering their languages, particularly Greek.

[71] E.g. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 2: 957–959 n. 75, who argues that the translation was necessary because people lost their Hebrew or Aramaic, that the need for the people's approval would not make sense if it was a royal mandate, nor is a festival likely to have celebrated the product of such a mandate. See the critical response in Orth, 'Ptolemaios' 104–105. R.T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), discusses the theories (liturgical, didactic, interlinear support for reading the Hebrew; 104–105). See also Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 53–66, who argues that there is no evidence in any of the texts indicating the grounds were liturgical or didactic; these are modern deductions (63). Siegert, *Bibel*, focuses primarily on synagogue needs as the reason for the translation (29).

[72] Accepting Ptolemy's initiative: Orth, 'Ptolemaios' 97–114; Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 63; Collins, *Library*, *passim*.

[73] The Byzantine scholar Georgios Kenenus reports that Ptolemy II initiated the translation to Greek of 100,000 books, including many from Egyptian and Chaldean (references in Orth, 'Ptolemaios' 106 n. 35). Orth argues that the openness to the non Hellenic world which a Macedonian background would have fostered is reflected already in Ptolemy I's visits to pagan temples and in that process texts would need to be translated. The interest is reflected in the work of Manetho who wrote a history of Egypt in Greek at the instigation of Ptolemy II and would have needed

government,[74] royal initiatives for all other known translations before second century BCE,[75] and to the possible influence of the Peripatetic School of Aristotle, represented by Demetrius,[76] but also by Theophrastus who also visited Ptolemy (D.L. V 37), and by Straton of Lampsacus, tutor to Philadelphus and successor of Theophrastus, which was showing an interest in collecting the laws of different states.[77] There is some evidence of resistance on the Jewish side to such a translation,[78] but

translations. Eratosthenes is alleged to have translated lists of kings from Thebes and the astrological writings of Hermippus assume Greek translation of Mesopotamian texts in the Alexandrian library.

[74] So M. Hengel, *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 94. Joseph Modrzejwski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), argues on the basis of the account of local law in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 3285, that the translation of the Jewish Law belongs to an official administrative action of the Ptolemies (104–105). See the discussion in Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, who notes there is no evidence for this, pointing rather to Ptolemy's cultural interests (63–64), but also noting the lack of mention of the presence of the Jewish Law in the Alexandrian library before that of Pseudo-Longinus in the first century CE Siegert, *Bibel*, claims that it would be unlikely to have been put in the library because it would not have been seen as literature (28). But it may have been seen as law.

[75] Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 63.

[76] On Demetrius of Phaleron see Green, *Alexander to Actium*, 36–51. He was strategos of Athens from 325/324 on and ruled Athens 317–307 under Kassander, until he was driven out by Demetrius Polioketes in 307. He came to Ptolemy I in Alexandria in 297—so Orth, 'Ptolemaios' 108.

[77] So Orth, 'Ptolemaios' 108–109, who notes Demetrius's creation of new laws in Athens. Aelian reports that he played a major role in developing law in Egypt alongside Ptolemy I (*Var. Hist.* III 17). He also notes Theophrastus' references to Palestine and Jews (109), referred to also in Josephus *Apion* I 166–167, and his interests in the laws of barbarian peoples, an interest most likely bearing fruit in the initiative to translate the Jewish Law. Orth concludes: 'So gibt es gute Gründe, dass man dei Übersetzung des hebräischen Textes in die hellenistische κοινή nicht ausschliesslich, so wie man es bisher fast immer getan hat, als eine interne Angelegenheit der jüdischen Gemeinde in Alexandreia betrachtet; es kommt vielmehr darauf an, auch den Anteil des Monarchen und der am Hof wirkenden Intellektuellen mit zu beachten. Ein starker Beweggrund war dabei das Bestreben, fremde Rechtsordnungen kennenzulernen. Dies ergibt sich aus der aristotelischen Schultradition; allerdings ist es keineswegs nur auf Angehörige des Peripatos beschränkt [he refers to Hecataeus of Abdera]; es findet im Übrigen Bestätigung in der Beurteilung des Übersetzungswerkes durch jüdische Autoren' (110). He also counters Rösel's suggestion that the focus was an interest in cosmology for which he finds no evidence (111). We might observe that as with Plato's *Timaeus* so with the Genesis creation stories and later apocalyptic 'science' creation and order serve to reinforce the sense of the order of Law and governance.

[78] On this see Veltri, *Talmai*. The Gaonic additons to *Megillat Ta'anit* 13 speak of three days of darkness coming over the land after the translation and *Soferim* 1.7–8 and *Sefer Tora* 1.8–9 compare its completion to the making of the golden calf. See Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 45. Resistance is already hinted at in Aristeas (312–316) and

their Sinai tradition also suggests the Law does belong to the nations, only that Israel alone agreed to observe it and this might have enabled some to affirm the undertaking,[79] which probably took place in the latter years of Philadelphus' reign, around 250 BCE.

awareness of problems in translation appears in the prologue to the Greek translation of Sirach by his grandson. Its earliest attested use of the LXX is in the late third century Jewish writer Demetrius, writing under Ptolemy IV Philopator, 221–204 BCE, who uses numbers of LXX and formulations from Genesis. Our earliest ms. is second cent BCE, Pap. Rylands 458 (Deuteronomy 23–28).

[79] So Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 19–20.

PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS: A NEW MOSES*

Paul McKechnie

In Egypt in the second century Jews manifested loyalty to the government alongside their piety when they put up dedication stones at their places of prayer. At Athribis (Benha, 48 km north of Cairo in the Nile Delta) a stone recorded that[1]

> On behalf of King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra, Ptolemy son of Epicydes, epistates of the guardsmen, and the Jews in Athribis, [dedicated] this place of prayer to Most High God.

This place of prayer was developed at the same time or later by adding space in the form of an exedra (probably a roofed area with three walls, providing seating), and there was a second dedication stone which said:[2]

> On behalf of King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra and their children, Hermias and his wife Philotera and their children dedicated this exedra for the place of prayer.

At Xenephyris (Kom el-Akhdar) in the reign of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes and Cleopatras II and III, the gateway of a place of prayer was dedicated on behalf of the king and queens;[3] and in the same reign at Nitriai (el-Barnugi, across Lake Mareotis from Alexandria) the place of prayer and its appurtenances were also dedicated on behalf of the king and queens.[4] Such dedications had first been made in the third century, and continued to be made for the rest of the Ptolemaic period and beyond.[5] I begin with the second-century ones[6] because they point

---

* *In memoriam* Prof. J.A. Crook, who in his lifetime kindly commented on a draft. All dates are BC. I wish to thank the Rev. Dr. Jeremy Corley for commenting on drafts of this chapter. He should not be assumed to agree with anything.

[1] Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 27.

[2] Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 28.

[3] Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 24.

[4] Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 25.

[5] See Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 22, from Schedia in Lower Egypt, put up under Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221); and Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 13, from Alexandria, set up in 37. Dedications of the Roman period include Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 126.

[6] Horbury and Noy, (*Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, p. 47), argue that because the king is

(though not necessarily more emphatically than others) to the existence in Egypt of a loyal Jewish community. Ptolemy son of Epicydes, for instance, bore a royal name and was an officer in the security forces.

These Jews, I assume, had not read 3 Maccabees, in which stories are told which have Ptolemy IV misbehaving at Jerusalem and persecuting Jews in Egypt. I will follow Moses Hadas, who argued that 3 Maccabees was written later than the Book of Aristeas, perhaps many years after (well into the first century),[7] and as a refutation of it, rather than Sterling Tracy, who argued the opposite, namely that the Book of Aristeas was written in response to 3 Maccabees.[8]

In the middle of the second century, Ptolemy Philometor allowed Onias son of Onias to build a Jewish temple, no less, at Leontopolis in the Heliopolite nome. When Josephus records a letter from Onias to Ptolemy asking for the necessary permission, it refers (rather as in the case of the places of prayer) to the temple being built "for the benefit of thyself, and thy wife and children".[9] It is noted in the letter that the prophet Isaiah foretold that there should be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God.[10] There at Leontopolis, Tell el-Yehoudieh, in 117, the first extant and datable one of a set of metrical epitaphs in Greek for Jews was set up, commemorating Demas, who (until he died at the age of 38) used his *sophia* to help people.[11] Demas was perhaps a doctor or a magistrate.[12]

Politically, the most important thing about the Jewish community in the 'district of Onias' was that it was a garrison, which might be expected to guard against any repetition of the Seleucid invasion

---

named first in *JIE* 27 it is unlikely to be from a time when a Cleopatra was acting as regent for her son or brother—so that the eligible periods are 194–180, 175–170, 145–140, 101–188, 80 and 79–68. At p. 49 they quote with approval A. Kasher's argument to the effect that no. 28 is likely to be of the same date as no. 27 rather than later.

[7] Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates*, 35–36; and earlier, Hadas, 'Aristeas and III Maccabees', 175–184, especially at 182–184. Victor A. Tcherikover argued even more emphatically than Hadas, contending that 'about a hundred years separate the two writers' ('The Third Book of Maccabees as Historical Source of Augustus' Time', 20).

[8] Tracy 'III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas'. Even 3 Maccabees refers to the loyalty of Jews towards the Ptolemaic kings: at the end of the text, having come to a better mind, Ptolemy IV writes in a letter that 'since we have taken into account the friendly and firm goodwill that they [the Jews] had towards us and our ancestors, we justly have acquitted them of every charge of whatever kind' (3 Maccabees 7.7).

[9] Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 13.68.

[10] Cf. Isaiah 19.19.

[11] Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, no. 30.

[12] Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*, pp. 55–60.

of Egypt which had been ended just outside Alexandria by Popillius Laenas' Roman diplomacy on the Day of Eleusis in 168. In 145, Onias led an army against Alexandria to defend Queen Cleopatra II and the sons of the late King Ptolemy VI Philometor against an attack by Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, who had come from the direction of Cyrene.[13] Events played out in Euergetes' favour, and he took power in Alexandria—though he also married Cleopatra, who remained as queen. The outcome was on the whole unfavourable for Onias, having supported Cleopatra; and it was at this time, if ever, that a Ptolemy got elephants riled up with alcohol and tried to set them to attack Jews.[14] But John M.G. Barclay seems to be right in arguing that Jews in Egypt were not in general disadvantaged after 145 in the wake of being on the wrong side; although anti-Jewish elements had acquired something which in the long term they could use in propaganda.[15]

So the decades between 150 and 100 were (broadly) harmonious times between the Jews of Egypt and the government of the Ptolemaic kingdom. It will be evident that I am focusing on this period because there is something approaching a consensus to the effect that this is when the Book of Aristeas was written.[16] Bezalel Bar-Kochva in his book about Pseudo-Hecataeus on the Jews surmises that the rise of the Hasmonean kingdom must have altered the dynamic of the situation:[17]

> Practicing Jews must … obviously have been uncomfortable about their continued residence in Egypt when the new Jewish state in the Promised Land established itself politically, considerably expanded its borders, and flourished economically.

I wonder if 'must … obviously have been uncomfortable' is true. There seems to be an echo of the twentieth century. John Barclay

---

[13] Josephus *Against Apion* 2.50–52.

[14] Josephus *Against Apion* 2.53–54: presented by Josephus as a move against Jews inside Alexandria, planned by Euergetes as an alternative to attempting to fight Onias' army.

[15] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 38–39.

[16] Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 142 and 271–288, argues in favour of 116 (or 118)-113. Oswyn Murray argues in favour of a date around 100 ('Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship', 338–339 and 368–370). Hadas argued in favour of a date not long after 132 (*Aristeas to Philocrates*, 54). Recently Raija Sollamo has restated the arguments in favour of 145–127, the date suggested by Elias Bickermann in 1930 (Sollamo, 'The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the LXX', 334; cf. Bickermann, 'Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas'), and Sylvie Honigman has argued in favour of the period between approximately 150 and 145 (*The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 129–130).

[17] Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 236.

discusses relations between Jews in Jerusalem and those in Egypt more cautiously.[18] And yet there was (stating the issue mildly) an easily discerned paradox in Jews living in Egypt.

Bar-Kochva summarizes the evidence from the Bible and later interpretation for what he calls "the explicit biblical prohibition and warnings not to emigrate to Egypt."[19] When the children of Israel were about to cross the Red Sea, Moses told them, "the Egyptians whom you see today you shall never see again".[20] In Deuteronomy the list of curses for disobedience culminates with the threat that if the Israelites disregard the Law "the Lord will bring you back in ships to Egypt, by a route that I promised you would never see again."[21] Isaiah says, "Alas for those who go down to Egypt for help";[22] Jeremiah, in the context of the neo-Babylonian campaign against Jerusalem in the early sixth century, warns against migrating to Egypt;[23] and Ezekiel comments on King Zedekiah rebelling against the Lord by sending ambassadors to Egypt.[24]

Egypt, in short, was the land of sin and slavery. Israel's God had first delivered his people from it into freedom, and then at Mount Sinai given them the Law to enable them to live right. This is a foundational narrative of the Jewish religion. Those Jews who did not occupy themselves reading the Law and the Prophets did not thereby remain unaware of the strangeness of living in Egypt. As Bar-Kochva notes,[25] "the annual celebration of the Passover kept reminding the people of the meaning of residence in Egypt." Their chief religious festival celebrated leaving Egypt, and yet (somehow), there they were.

This is, as it were, a mise-en-scène: the summary of facts one should desirably know before beginning to read the Book of Aristeas, which

---

[18] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 35–36, citing the letters quoted at the beginning of 2 Maccabees (2 Maccabees 1.1–2.18) and arguing that they show close contacts between Jerusalem and Jews in Egypt in the second century.

[19] Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 79 and 234–236. 234 n. 8 cites later sources in which Deut. 17.16 is understood as legislating against migrating to Egypt, at any rate under ordinary circumstances.

[20] Exodus 14.13.

[21] Deuteronomy 28.68.

[22] Isaiah 31.1.

[23] Jeremiah 42.13–17.

[24] Ezekiel 17.14.

[25] Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 235. Note also the 'Passover papyrus' (Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, p. 491), in which Darius II authorizes the Jewish garrison at Elephantine to keep the Passover in 419. I wish to thank the Rev. Dr. Jeremy Corley for drawing my attention to this document.

was written by a Jew living in Egypt in this period. The text is written as if by Aristeas, a Gentile courtier in the service of Ptolemy II, and it describes how Ptolemy II came to want the Jewish Law translated into Greek, how translators were brought from Jerusalem to Alexandria, how they were entertained there and answered the king's questions (this is a large part of the book), and finally how they made the translation, then went home.

Aristeas is hard to classify. Henry Meecham not unfairly said it was "an interesting and readable narrative, despite its length and its somewhat tedious descriptions".[26] Referring to the text as a novel, Günther Zuntz in 1959 said that "We may … begin by surveying the structure of Aristeas' novel, paying particular attention to the manner in which the author connected its constituent parts."[27] Zuntz did not develop the idea further—the point of his article was to discuss what Aristeas says about the translation of the Torah. Is there a case for thinking of the Book of Aristeas as a novel? Its longest section is about questions on how a king should behave, answered at seven banquets in Ptolemy II's palace—a feature which might make it look more than anything like a kind of mirror of princes. Even so, the book as a whole is essentially a narrative. Διήγησις is the term the author employs in line 1. There are plot, characters, travel—and a beginning, a middle and an end.

The difficulty is what is missing. Lawrence M. Wills in his book about the Jewish novel in the ancient world observes that:[28]

> Between about 200 B.C.E. and 100 C.E., Jewish authors wrote many entertaining narratives marked by fanciful and idealized settings, adventurous tone, happy endings, and important women characters.

While three of these four items are there (on a generous view) in Aristeas, there are no women in the story. This sets Aristeas apart from the texts which Wills discusses in the greatest detail in his book, Tobit, Esther, Judith and Joseph and Aseneth, which share some genre features with Greek novels (though Wills is scrupulous, also, in defining differences).[29] Nor does Wills include Aristeas in his category of Jewish historical novels.[30]

---

[26] Meecham, *Letter of Aristeas*, 1.
[27] Zuntz, 'Aristeas Studies II', 109.
[28] Wills, *The Jewish Novel*, 1.
[29] Wills, *The Jewish Novel*, 16–28.
[30] Wills, *The Jewish Novel*, 185–212.

Sylvie Honigman in her book has suggested a new approach to the issue of genre, discussing the Book of Aristeas with reference to how it relates to the development of Greek literature.[31] She notes the exceptional place which the survival of Aristeas has given it (in view of the loss of nearly all Hellenistic prose literature),[32] and argues that it is "certainly a reasonably representative example of contemporary Alexandrian literature". She looks to poetry and to rhetorical handbooks for parallels to the way Aristeas is structured.[33] Perhaps it would have been wiser not to assert positively that it must be representative of a category of texts nearly all of which are lost. But Honigman uses persuasively such evidence as there is. Discussion of the place in the narrative of poikilia combined with elements of ring-composition and use of digressions leads her to define the text more precisely as a kind of historical monograph,[34] and go on to discuss the relations of truth and pleasure in the text.[35] She cites with approval Hadas' classification of Aristeas as a Greek book,[36] and notes how the narrative of Book of Aristeas 182 (dealing with how food and drink were provided for the seventy-two translators) says that Greeks from different cities have different dietary requirements—so that (implicitly) "the Jews are no more peculiar than any other Greek people".[37]

The variety of elements in the Aristeas narrative has prompted scholars to consider on what sources the author drew. Oswyn Murray in 1975 pointed out that those sources can be divided into three main types:[38] Jewish literature, Greek literature, and official documents. The least controversial of Aristeas' sources, Murray said, was the Pentateuch—and he pointed out that the description of the vestments of the High Priest (Book of Aristeas 96–99) is based on Exodus 28 and 29, while the table presented by Ptolemy as a diplomatic gift is said (Book of Aristeas 62–72) to have been made in accordance with the provisions of the Law (cf. Exodus 25).[39] Murray's example of

[31] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*. The use here of the term *Book of Aristeas* follows Honigman's persuasive analysis (1–2) of what the text should best be called.
[32] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 13.
[33] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 14–25 (quotation from 15).
[34] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 30.
[35] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 30–35.
[36] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 13.
[37] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 17.
[38] Murray, 'Aristeas and his Sources', 124.
[39] Murray, 'Aristeas and his Sources', 124.

Greek literature as a source is perhaps in a sense problematic, since it is pseudo-Hecataeus' On the Jews—which was written by a Jewish author. Bezalel Bar-Kochva in 1996 showed more conclusively than earlier scholars that the writer of pseudo-Hecataeus was a native of the Egyptian Jewish diaspora.[40] Assuming that Bar-Kochva is right, Greek literature is only a source of a source as far as the Book of Aristeas is concerned. As for official documents, Murray points to William Linn Westermann's observations concerning parallels between the decree freeing Jewish slaves and compensating their owners in the Book of Aristeas (21–27) and the decrees preserved in Rainer Papyrus (PER) Inv. 24,552. Whether or not the author of the Book borrowed terminology and wording directly (as Westermann suggests),[41] official documents were at least in some sense a source.

Raija Sollamo in 2001 addressed the Book from the viewpoint of the style of redaction criticism practised by Bible scholars, and she asks whether the Letter could possibly be a literary whole. Her implicit answer is no. She notes that[42]

> The beginning and the end seem to fit together, but the first 50 chapters contain an extensive excursus about the liberation of the Jewish slaves in Egypt, an episode which remains quite separate without any connection with anything mentioned either before or afterwards.

Afterwards she develops her account in the direction of arguing that Aristeas is supportive of a liberal position in a debate within the Alexandrian Jewish community relating to the true nature of the community's Jewish heritage[43]—and does not expound how she envisages that the redaction resulting in the present text took place. J.-G. Février in 1925 had offered a more fully developed theory of sources and redaction, including the suggestion that sections 83 to 171 were interpolated;[44] but if Honigman's defence of the work as a unitary text composed using principles including poikilia is accepted, the stylistic differences within the text are sufficiently explained and a hypothesis involving interpolation becomes redundant.

Moses Hadas in the introduction to his 1951 edition comments (following one of Février's suggestions) that "insofar as Aristeas is an

---

[40] Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 148.
[41] Westermann, 'Enslaved Persons who are Free', 21.
[42] Sollamo, 'Letter of Aristeas', 330.
[43] Sollamo, 'Letter of Aristeas', 338.
[44] Février, *La date*.

account of a new promulgation of the Law it is reminiscent of the story told in Ezra and Nehemiah". Février's hypothesis was that Aristeas used these books freely and perhaps in part unconsciously, as a model.[45] Hadas lists eight parallels, which (in brief) are the following:[46]

(a) Nehemiah petitions the king on behalf of the distressed inhabitants of Jerusalem; Aristeas intercedes with the king on behalf of the enslaved Jews in Egypt.
(b) Ezra thanks God for granting him favour with the king and his counsellors; Aristeas secures the cooperation of the king's officers, Sosibius and Andreas.
(c) Ezra and Nehemiah journey to Jerusalem carrying royal letters; Aristeas visits Jerusalem carrying a letter from King Ptolemy.
(d) Ezra goes to Jerusalem with royal presents destined for the Temple; Aristeas takes royal gifts for the Temple.
(e) In the decree of Darius, the Jews are encouraged to offer God sacrifices for the king, his consort, children and friends; in the Book of Aristeas, Eleazar, the High Priest, says he has offered sacrifices for the king, his consort, children and friends.
(f) Nehemiah assembles the people for a solemn reading of the Law; Demetrius assembles the Jews of Alexandria and reads the Greek translation of the Law.
(g) Ezra 6 and 7 contain official communications; letters from King Ptolemy and High Priest Eleazar are contained in Aristeas.
(h) In Ezra embassies consisting of twelve representatives are mentioned; in Aristeas there are seventy-two translators, a multiple of twelve.

There are items in this list whose importance could be debated: for example (b), because Ezra thanks the Lord for extending to him his steadfast love "before the king and his counsellors, and before all the king's mighty officers"[47]—but in Aristeas the (fictively-Gentile) ego-narrator does not attribute the success of his petition directed to Sosibius and Andreas (which he says he has been pressing for some time) to the love of the Almighty. None the less it is fair to say that

[45] Février, *La date*, 32–36; Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates*, 38.
[46] Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates*, 38–39. Note also (re [h]) that Nehemiah 10.2–28 lists 84 (= 7 × 12) signatories for the covenant renewal document (cf. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 281 and Duggan, *Covenant Renewal*, 243): I wish to thank the Rev. Dr. Jeremy Corley for drawing my attention to this passage.
[47] Ezra 7.28.

the list as a whole establishes what Hadas says it does, namely that the Ezra-Nehemiah narratives probably had a part in the shaping of the story told in the Book of Aristeas.

I am less convinced by Oswyn Murray's suggestion that 1 Esdras was the version of the Ezra-Nehemiah story which Aristeas had primarily in mind, and in particular I am not inclined to agree that the debate of the three bodyguards in 1 Esdras about which is the most powerful (wine, the king, women, or truth) "may well have suggested Aristeas' own contest of the seventy-two Jewish elders before Ptolemy".[48] For one thing, the king's conversation with the seventy-two elders in Aristeas is not a competition (each of the speakers gets a reward of three talents of silver and a slave).[49] Hadas' parallels work best if the biblical Ezra and Nehemiah are assumed to be the texts drawn on.

Therefore the Hebrew Bible is of the greatest importance in the background to the Book of Aristeas, and there is something to be gained by considering further Oswyn Murray's other observation, namely that the Pentateuch is an important source for the story it tells. He notes the vestments for the High Priest and the table for the Temple—both from Exodus. But Exodus has more to offer. Consider the following.

In Exodus Moses leads the children of Israel out of slavery in Egypt. They then go to Mount Sinai, where they are given the Ten Commandments, and other laws, and it is promised that they will conquer the land of Canaan. Next Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, are called to worship the Lord at a distance, and after a sacrifice they go up and see God, whereupon:[50]

> … they saw the God of Israel. Under his feet there was something like a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heaven for clearness. God did not lay his hand on the chief men of the people of Israel; also they beheld God, and they ate and drank.

Once this moment is past, Moses is called to come up to the Lord on the mountain, where he receives the tablets of stone, "with the law and the commandment, which I have written for their instruction."[51]

---

[48] 1 Esdras 3.1–4.42; Murray, 'Aristeas and his Sources', 126.
[49] Book of Aristeas 294.
[50] Exodus 24.10–11.
[51] Exodus 24.12.

In Aristeas, Ptolemy Philadelphus sets the Jews free from slavery in Egypt. Having done this, he receives the Law of the Lord, in Greek translation. The seventy-two translators who are sent by the High Priest correspond to the seventy elders of Israel, plus Nadab and Abihu, who (together with Moses and Aaron) "beheld God, and they ate and drank". While a direct vision of God is not claimed in the Letter as one of the qualifications of the seventy-two translators, their qualities as liminal figures bridging two worlds are expounded in another way; they were:[52]

> … men most excellent and of outstanding scholarship, to be expected in persons of such distinguished parentage. They had not only acquired proficiency in the literature of the Jews, but had bestowed no slight study on that of the Greeks also. They were therefore well qualified to be sent on embassies, and performed this office whenever there was need. They possessed great natural talent for conferences and discussions pertaining to the Law. They zealously cultivated the quality of the mean (and that is the best course), and eschewing a crude and uncouth disposition, they likewise avoided conceit and the assumption of superiority over others.

The elders in Exodus bridge the heavenly and earthly worlds by beholding God but living to eat and drink; the translators in Aristeas bridge the Jewish and Greek worlds.

The giving of the Septuagint, then, as the story is told in Aristeas, is patterned on the giving of the Law in Exodus. That this should be so is no great surprise in view of the way the High Priest's vestments and the table for the Temple also feature, or in view of the way the Ezra-Nehemiah narrative is drawn on in the arrangement of the story.

For a long time this feature of Aristeas went unremarked; Honigman then brought it into her 2003 study unobtrusively, referring to it as the 'Exodus paradigm', alongside another narrative paradigm which she has more to say about and which she calls the 'Alexandrian paradigm'. This is a narrative pattern relating to the prestige of Alexandria and the Ptolemaic dynasty. Reduced to essentials, the pattern amounts to this:[53]

1. The king wants something which is lacking in Alexandria but would add to his prestige.
2. The king sends an embassy, letter, financial means to a destination abroad, in order to get the required item sent to Alexandria.

[52] Book of Aristeas 121–122.
[53] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 41–42.

3. The requested item is sent.
4. The item is settled in its assigned location in Alexandria.

Honigman observes how the Alexandrian paradigm as a narrative pattern occurs elsewhere, for instance in Tacitus when he tells the story of Sarapis being brought to Alexandria:[54] a statue of Jupiter Dis is sent for, from Sinope, and when King Scydrothemis hesitates to dispatch it as requested, first a plague and other divinely-sent disasters happen at Sinope, and then finally the statue gets up, walks down to the harbour, and embarks on King Ptolemy's ship to sail to Alexandria (where a temple is built for it).[55]

That the story of bringing the Jewish Law to Alexandria follows a similar pattern is clear. But Honigman notes the presence, as a secondary theme, of the 'Exodus paradigm': perhaps surprisingly, she describes its function as "easier to pin down than was the case with the main theme".[56] The theme is present, she argues, in three episodes: first, the freeing of the Jewish slaves; second, the selection of the seventy-two elders; and third, the proclamation of the translation of the Law.[57]

Noah Hacham's recent article on Aristeas as a new Exodus story responds to Honigman's definition of the place of the 'Exodus paradigm' within Aristeas, and in effect argues that it is not as secondary as Honigman thought. Hacham's reading of Aristeas lays stress on the way it 'provides a new account of the foundation stories of the Israelites … as taking place in Egypt,'[58] and so justifying Jewish residence there. It is, in short, a book that attempts to create the foundation story of Hellenistic Jewry: a Jewry that interweaves different worlds[59]—and therefore finds a problem in the biblical Exodus story, because leaving Egypt is such an integral part of it. Aristeas addresses this problem by constructing a reworking of the Exodus narrative—a "non-Exodus' story" (a phrase Hacham borrows from Honigman),[60] while not mentioning the biblical Exodus.

---

[54] Tacitus Histories 4.83–84; cf. Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 49–50.

[55] In Plutarch *Isis and Osiris* 28, the statue is stolen from Sinope by named Ptolemaic officials.

[56] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 53.

[57] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 53–63.

[58] Hacham, 'New Exodus Story', 19.

[59] Hacham, 'New Exodus Story', 16.

[60] Hacham, 'New Exodus Story', 8, citing Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 56.

Hacham's article supplies an important corrective: surely Honigman downplayed too severely the importance of the Exodus paradigm in Aristeas. I suggest that in addition she has underestimated the importance of Ptolemy Philadelphus within the Exodus paradigm, and as a consequence gone too far in the direction of placing Aristeas in the tradition of Greek rhetoric, while not saying enough about comparisons between it and apocryphal or deuterocanonical biblical literature.

Commenting on the freeing of Jewish slaves, Honigman refers to King Ptolemy as "acting in the role of Pharaoh" and says that he is "staged as a benevolent Pharaoh, willingly liberating the Jews at Aristeas' request".[61] This is true, but not exhaustive. The seventy-two translators, at the king's seven banquets, metaphorically accompany Philadelphus into the foothills of the holy mountain; and it is Philadelphus to whom the translation of the Law is given. Therefore Philadelphus is figured in Aristeas not just as a new Pharaoh (without the unreasonable attitudes of that old Pharaoh whose obstinacy brought plagues on Egypt), but actually as a new Moses.[62]

It may seem counterintuitive to read Aristeas as implicitly figuring Ptolemy Philadelphus as Moses. To see why this could be done by a second-century writer it is necessary to move beyond the bounds of the Greek rhetoric which Honigman discusses and look at a broader context—the context (novelistic and otherwise) of biblical and quasi-biblical literature of the fourth to second centuries BC. Much of the preserved writing in this category is writing about the Bible. Many texts are structured on biblical ideas. Erich Gruen comments that "Hellenistic Jews took great pleasure in retelling biblical tales",[63] and this observation is good even on a broader canvas than the one Gruen applies it to in his chapter on Biblical Recreations, where he discusses the Testament of Abraham, the Testament of Job, and Artapanus. In a number of cases, books in this category consist of what I propose to call 'riffs' on key biblical ideas.

Riff, as far as I know, is not a technical term in biblical studies. I wondered if the word I wanted was 'midrash', but the process of

[61] Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 53.

[62] Several biblical figures are explicitly or implicitly likened to Moses, as Allison argues in *The New Moses: a Matthean Typology*. Allison's main point is to discuss how Jesus in Matthew is like Moses; but he draws attention also to Joshua, Gideon, Samuel, David, Elijah, Josiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Ezra, Baruch (23–68) and others. The Moses analogy, then, formed part of the vocabulary of approval in the biblical tradition.

[63] Gruen, *Diaspora*, 182.

patterning to which I am referring is not precisely midrashic. It is more a matter of telling a new story in a way which recalls and reflects on a biblical story. In Devorah Dimant's terms, "compositional use of biblical elements" (not expositional use) is involved.[64] So for example Tobit, which in detail reflects on a number of biblically-derived concerns (including the exile of the northern Israelite tribes), is as a whole a riff based on the story of the marriage of Isaac and Rebecca. So Abraham in the Bible tells the servant whom he sends on a journey to find a wife for Isaac that "the Lord … will send his angel before you";[65] but when Tobit tells Tobias to find a trustworthy man to show him the way to Media, Tobias providentially finds Raphael (an angel, as Tobias does not at first realize—so that the biblical idea of the Lord sending his angel is echoed and made more literal).[66] Similarly the book of Judith is a riff on the story of Jael and Sisera: Wills discusses the way the "mirror narrative" (as he calls it) is used in Judith, and how differences were built in.[67]

Esther is a riff on the theme of Saul and Agag: Mordecai (a Benjaminite and a member, like Saul, of the Kish family)[68] encounters Haman (an Agagite, that is to say, a member of the Amalekite royal family);[69] but unlike Saul, Mordecai and Esther are not too irresolute to see Haman hanged on the gallows he built for Mordecai, and to take over his house[70]—so carrying out the commandment to blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven.[71]

Ecclesiasticus, though not a narrative work, is also a riff, in this case on Proverbs: a number of structural features recall the canonical book, for example chapter 24, in which (as in Proverbs 8) a personified Wisdom recalls how she was created by the Lord.[72] Ecclesiasticus is an important parallel to Aristeas if (as I argued in 2001) Ecclesiasticus was written in Alexandria in the early second century, and translated

---

64 Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation of Mikra', 382.
65 Genesis 24.7.
66 Tobit 5.3–8.
67 Wills, *The Jewish Novel*, 146–148.
68 Esther 2.5.
69 'Haman … the Agagite': Esther 3.1; King Agag of the Amalekites spared by Saul: 1 Samuel 15.8–9.
70 Esther 7.9–8.2.
71 'I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven' and 'The Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation': Exodus 17.14 and 16.
72 Ecclesiasticus 24.3; Proverbs 8.22.

into Greek in the second half of the century,[73] either before or after Aristeas was written.[74] The community context behind both works would be similar, and by writing a riff on Exodus as an apologia for the Septuagint the composer of Aristeas was not out of line with the way in which riffs were a principal tool used by other authors of quasi-biblical works of comparable date. It is not possible to be exact about the dates of Tobit, Judith or the various versions of Esther, and this fact makes it hard to be precise about the stage the tradition had reached by the time of the Book of Aristeas, and what precedents were available to the author. It is worth remembering in addition (as Février and Hadas noted) that the author of Aristeas had Ezra and Nehemiah in mind, and so was structuring his reminiscences around more than one biblical text.

I suggest therefore that the route to advancing understanding of Aristeas lies through combining Sylvie Honigman's insight into the place the text occupies in the tradition of Greek rhetoric and historiography with a bold conception of it as a work in the developing tradition of Jewish quasi-biblical literature of the Hellenistic period. As its author notoriously said,[75] "the same God who has given [the Jews] their law guides your [Ptolemy Philadelphus'] kingdom also, as I have learned in my researches". It was a book well suited to the loyal and pro-Ptolemaic Jewish community in which it was produced; and the way it figured Philadelphus as a new Moses was daring, perhaps—but no more extravagant than the parallel it drew between the gods of the Ptolemies and the Jews.

[73] McKechnie, 'Career of Joshua Ben Sira'.

[74] Translated after 132, cf. Ecclesiasticus prologue: 'I came into Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes'. On the date of *Aristeas* see n. 16 above.

[75] Book of Aristeas 15.

PHILADELPHUS' ALEXANDRIA AS CRADLE OF BIBLICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Philippe Guillaume

Properly speaking, the term 'Septuagint' only applies to the Greek translation of the Hebrew Law, but it is commonly used to designate the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures translated into Greek. And rightly so, since the other Hebrew books were soon translated as well. The focus here is on the biblical books that are classified in the LXX under the title 'Historical Books'.

The classification of these scrolls as a historical collection is acquiring fresh relevance as the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis put forward by Martin Noth in 1943 is losing favour. While bombers were flattening the remains of the Germanic dream, Noth identified the razing of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 586 BCE as the event that spurred a historian to collect old traditions and put them together on a chronological line (Noth 1957:1–110). This Deuteronomistic History was to furnish a theodicy to traumatized Judaeans, explaining that the destruction of Jerusalem did not imply the defeat of Yhwh by Marduk, but that it had been brought about by Yhwh himself who had repeatedly sent his prophets to warn Israel. Noth's historian crafted a chronological narrative that was eventually split up into the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. The theory has been accepted by Old Testament scholars for the last fifty years, although they begin to realize that the hypothesis suited the post-World War II situation better than it actually fits the biblical evidence, besides the fact that it also entails attributing to Jerusalem the invention of history a good century before Herodotus (Davies 1989:360–375; Knauf 2000:388–398; Rösel 2000:195–212; Kratz 2005:216–217).

Seeking a new model for the formation of the historical collection, Alexandria seems a promising field of inquiry since it is the LXX that labels the collection as historical, whereas the Hebrew canon classifies its authors as the Former Prophets. The work of some Alexandrian scholars and the evidence from the Dead Sea scrolls will be examined to determine the possible role of Alexandria in the formation of the biblical historical collection. Before proceeding further, note that I am

not suggesting like the members of the 'Copenhagen school' that the Old Testament was written during the Hellenistic period (Thompson 2003:1–15). I believe, as moderate biblical scholars do, that a major part of the OT (maybe half) was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. All the books contained in the Former Prophets had almost reached their final form when Alexander's armies flooded the East. The question here is how these texts became Scripture.

Aristeas

For three centuries the author of the Letter of Aristeas was considered a forger and a liar. In the 1950s Moses Hadas considered it as a *plasma*, insisting that its imaginative treatment of history did preserve historical verisimilitude (Hadas 1951:57–58). Other works gave rise to the so-called legal and cultural hypothesis, until Nina Collins' and Sylvie Honigman's recent work arguing independently from each other that the link between Ptolemy Philadelphus and the Septuagint is credible.[1] Reviewers disputed Collins' notion of the opposition of some Jewish leaders to the translation,[2] while accepting that the translation of the Torah was commissioned by the royal court between the reign of Philadelphos and the early second century BCE. At about the same time, the Indian king Asoka ordered that his Indian edicts should be translated into Aramaic and Greek, which also strengthens Aristeas' claim. I will not go into the reasons for the translation of the LXX; the question here is limited to what happened after the translation of the Torah.

We know nothing about the circumstances of the translation of the other Hebrew books, although the letter of Aristeas provides some clues. According to Aristeas, Demetrius of Phalerum reported a list of Jewish books missing to complete the Library. Besides the Law, he mentions a few other books (ἑτέροις ὀλίγοις, LetAris. §30). This is significant, since Aristeas' concern is the Law. It reflects that in his days,

[1] Collins 2000. Honigman 2003, 88–116. See also the contributions by Johann Cook, William Loader and Paul McKechnie in this volume.

[2] Fernández Marcos 2002, 99; Passoni Dell'Acqua 2002, 123–126 points out that according to Veltri 1994 there is no evidence of Jewish opposition to the LXX before the Gaonim. Wasserstein 2003 wrote a devastating review of Collin's book without engaging her arguments.

up to a century after Ptolemy Philadelphos (Honigman 2003:130), other Hebrew books had been translated and added to the Library.

Another indication comes from a question put to Demetrius during the ceremony celebrating the completion of the translation. The king asks Demetrius why none of the poets or prose writers (συγγραφεῖς) has ever mentioned the Hebrew Torah (LetAr. 312). Besides providing Aristeas with the opportunity to praise the noble character of the legislation, Ptolemy's question also suggests one aim of the translation of Hebrew books. In the same passage (LetAr. 314–316) Aristeas mentions Theopompos and Theodectos who attempted to insert elements of the Hebrew law in their works. Whatever the historicity of such claims, they indicate that the translation would naturally supply Greek authors with literary material. This passage corresponds to Demetrius' report to the king at the beginning of the book where Aristeas has Demetrius quote the historian Hekataios of Abdera (LetAr. 31). Hekataios was contemporary to King Ptolemy I (306–283 BCE) and to Demetrius. His mention at the beginning of the book thus adds historians to the list of potential readers of a translation of Hebrew books. One of the fragments of Hekataios' work has the historian express great surprise to the fact that the Jews never had a king (Diodorus Siculus 40.3). Writing during the days of Philadelphos, Hekataios had no access to the books of Samuel and Kings most probably because they were not yet translated. Hekataios' surprise and his mention by Aristeas show that Alexandrian scholars would have been at least as interested as local Jews in the translation of other books held by the Jerusalem temple library. As was the case with the Law, the spur to produce a history of the Jews would have come from Ptolemaic circles rather than from Jerusalem, for academic rather than religious motives. This is confirmed when we look at what other Alexandrian scholars were up to at the time of the translation of the Septuagint.

Other Alexandrian Scholars

The influence of the Alexandrian canons of Greek and Egyptian literature on the canon of Hebrew Writings (*Ketubim*) has been recognized (Lang 1998:45–65; Pury 1999:163–198). Is a similar influence on the historical books plausible? Some fifty years after the date suggested by Aristeas for the translation of the Jewish Law, Eratosthenes wrote a chronological framework for Greek history, the *Olumpionikai*

and the *Chronographiai*. The influence of the chronographers is obvious on some biblical chronological systems (Larsson 2000:215). But their influence could even reach the very ordering of Hebrew past into well defined periods: the conquest with the book of Joshua, the period of the Judges with Judges and Ruth, the Kingdoms with Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, the Persian period with Esther and Esdras (Ezra-Nehemiah). Later, the chronography was extended to the Hellenistic period with Daniel and Maccabees. 'Chronography' better fits the nature of the biblical historical books than 'historiography'. A historian compares sources and then writes a coherent narrative of what he determined as what most likely happened, whereas the historical collection simply joins previously independent books with minimal redactional activity to establish the transition. This is particularly obvious with the books of Joshua and Judges (Davies 1998:112–113; Schmid 1999:218–220.374; Guillaume 2004:227–253). On the other hand, some books dealing with the same subject are merely juxtaposed, like Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. The formation of the historical collection does not constitute historiography *per se*, but a repository of material presented chronologically, a chronography of Hebrew past produced in the wake of Eratosthenes' work. Such chronography would enable historians to do what Hekataios could not do for lack of material.

That Josephus' *Antiquities* are the earliest instance of such a History of Israel transmitted to us does not exclude the hypothesis that Alexandria produced previous ones, since in the preface of his *Antiquities*, Josephus admits that before him "some of the Greeks took considerable pains to know the affairs of our nation." (*Ant.* Preface 2). These elements call for a fresh appraisal of the origin of the Joshua-Kings sequence. Many Biblical scholars still consider that it was created by the Deuteronomistic Historian. If they have abandoned Noth's hypothesis, they still imagine that the Former Prophets were organized as a chronological collection well before Ptolemaic times. This must be questioned for two reasons. The Joshua-Kings succession is congruent with the Hellenistic concept of historiographic periodization, but this very concept is rejected in the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew collection of Former Prophets contains almost the same list of books as the Greek *Historika*, but presented as prophecy instead of historiography. If the Former Prophets had been organized on the lines of historiographic periodization since the sixth century BCE, it is strange to find that the first attestation of their order is as late as 175 BCE and comes from Alexandria in

Ecclesiasticus 44–49. Ben Sira labours to show the relevance of the Prophets after the Torah (Goshen-Gottstein 2002:253–254), while the Joshua-Kings sequence is perfectly at home in the LXX's *Historika*.

To replace Noth's Deuteronomistic Historian, it is even possible to suggest a name for the creator of the Biblical Chronography. The most likely candidate is Demetrius the Chronographer, a kind of Jewish Eratosthenes who worked during the third century BCE, and who also happens to be the first witness of the use of the Greek Torah. Fragment 6 of his work follows the chronology of the LXX. His consistent use of the Greek text and his chronological precision place him very close to the school that organized Joshua-Esther into a Chronography. His readiness to disagree with the chronology of the Masoretic and Samaritan texts indicates that in Demetrius' days, there was no authoritative version of the Hebrew past. He was thus free to produce his own. Is there further evidence suggesting that the historical collection was organized at Alexandria rather than earlier at Jerusalem?

First, there is Eupolemus (157 BCE) who in a passage about prophets does not mention any of the figures in the book of Judges. This would not be surprising, had he not referred to Joshua as prophet—although Joshua is never called prophet in the book that bears his name: "Then Joshua the son of Nun prophesied for thirty years. He lived one hundred and ten years and pitched the sacred tabernacle in Shiloh. After this Samuel was prophet" (Eupolemus Frag. 2:1–2).[3] Although he considers Joshua as a prophet, Eupolemus skips Deborah (identified as prophetess in Judg. 4:4) and the anonymous prophet of Judg. 6:7. Either Eupolemus did not know Judges, or he did not consider it part of a prophetic collection. In any case, he did not know the 'Deuteronomistic History'. This casts doubts on the existence of the collection of Former Prophets prior to the second century BCE. The individual books were long written and almost completed, but Judges had not yet been inserted between Joshua and Samuel-Kings to produce a particular period between the Conquest and the age of the Kingdoms.[4]

[3] Charlesworth 1983, 2.866 and note e. Wacholder 1974, links Eupolemos and Demetrius the Chronographer with a biblical chronographical school which flourished during the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–204 BCE).

[4] Schmid 1999, 218–220 shows that the transition Joshua/ Judges and Judges/Samuel is no earlier than Joshua 24, the latest chapter of the book.

Dead Sea Scrolls

The large number of biblical manuscripts found among the Dead Sea scrolls provides an indirect indication on the circulation of individual books in the centuries before and after the turn of the era. Evaluating the evidence from Qumran is difficult since we do not know whether the assemblage reflects the stock of a scroll factory or the holdings of a library; but it is all that we have, and the sample is sufficiently large to offer some reasonable statistics.

While the canonicity of the Torah is beyond doubt at this time, only one of the Pentateuch books belongs to the top three most represented books in the Dead Sea scrolls: Deuteronomy—the two others being Isaiah and Psalms, indicating that Qumran statistics cannot be used to establish canonicity (Flint 2001:45–103). In spite of those reservations, Flint confidently identifies as Scripture the Torah, the Latter Prophets (including Daniel) and David (Psalms). He concludes that the Qumran community was less concerned with Israel's later history and with wisdom traditions than it was with the covenant although the community did regard as Scripture Samuel, Kings, Tobit, Proverbs, and Lamentations (Flint 2001:81).

There is no need to enter the debated issue over the Qumran community and its relation to the Dead Sea scrolls. It is enough for the purpose at hand to note that all of the historical books (excepted Esther) are attested among the Dead Sea scrolls, but in very small quantities. Flint concludes that "Almost all the Prophets, including Daniel, were viewed as scripture; however, the status of Joshua, Judges, and the Epistle of Jeremiah are not fully assured" (Flint 2001:82). It is, however, misleading to claim that only the status of Joshua and Judges is in doubt. Such uncertainty applies to the entire collection of Former Prophets. The Dead Sea scrolls contain a dozen of manuscripts of 'books' of the Former Prophet or texts referring to figures from the Former Prophets (Flint 2001:62–63):

Joshua: 2 Mss (4QJosh^{ab})
Judges: 3 Mss (1QJudg, 4QJudg^{ab})
Samuel: 4 Mss (1QSam, 4QSam^{abc}). Samuel has the best attestation, possibly as a consequence of the *Davidiphilia* of 11QPs that ascribes more Psalms to David than the LXX and the MT do.[5]

[5] Charlesworth 1997.

Kings: 3 Mss (4QKgs; 5QKgs; pap6QKgs). The status of *Kings* is thus as insecure as that of Judges.

Among biblical citations in non-biblical works (Florilegia, Catenae, Pesharim and specific works like *Rule of the Community* and *Damascus Document*), the only citation from the Former Prophets is found in Testimonia (4Q175) with a quote of Apocryphon of Joshua[b] (4Q379 22.ii) (Bernstein 2000). The only books for which *pesharim* are extant are from the Latter Prophets.[6]

In all, this amounts to 2 % of some 800 manuscripts. Another half dozen manuscripts (a 50 % increase) can be added if the attention shifts from the Former Prophets to the Septuagint's historical collection. Ruth (2QRuth[ab], 4QRuth[ab]) is attested four times, like Samuel, and better than Joshua, Judges and Kings. It is easier to argue that the LXX's historical collection is older and was thus better established even in Palestine, than claiming that the LXX is a Christian alteration of the Hebrew corpus of Former Prophets. The period of the Judges represented by the Judges-Ruth combination transmitted by the Greek historical books is likely to predate the Hebrew canon which places Ruth among the Writings.[7] Indeed, the sample is so small, that no difference of status in canonicity can be inferred, but it is sufficient to raise serious doubts over the existence of a venerable Deuteronomistic History before Philadelphus.

Recensions of Biblical Historical Books in Greek

Greek recensions of the historical books support the same conclusion. Isaiah was probably the first prophetic book translated after the Torah. But the situation concerning the Former Prophets is less clear. Whereas Joshua is fairly close to the MT, Greek Judges present a freer translation

---

[6] Ulrich 1999, 60: Pesharim Isaiah (4Q161–165); P.Micah (1Q14; 4Q168?); P.Nahum (4Q169); P.Zephaniah (1Q15; 4Q170); P.Hosea (4Q166–167); P.Malachi (5QpMal). Joel is attested in Catena[a] (4Q106). Jeremiah is mentioned in 4QCatenaB (4Q182) but as book, not as prophet.

[7] This must be qualified by the fact that both 4QRuth[a] and [b] transmit the first verses of *Ruth* with no trace of the last verses of Judges. The same applies to 4QJudg[b] that bears the last verses of Judges (21:12–25) with no trace of the beginning of Ruth. However, the scope of these lacks of transition is reduced by the fact that the DSS are scrolls and not codices.

with a number of facilitations. The most striking feature is the transition between Joshua and Judges, which suggests that LXX's longer text at the end of Joshua points to a shorter combined version of Joshua-Judges (Tov 2003:127). This combined version replaced the first chapters of Judges with various additions at the end of Joshua. It was a kind of epitome improving the awkward transition in the Hebrew version or produced before the Hebrew transition was written. Not only did it translate Joshua and Judges, it also summarized and harmonized their contents so that each one presented a distinct period with the era of the Judges clearly subsequent to that of the Conquest. Such a work would more likely be produced before the canonicity of Joshua and Judges was established.

Greek recensions reveal that during the third century BCE, the Former Prophets were not considered as a canonical collection like the Pentateuch since they were not dealt with in a unified manner. The evidence available so far suggests that the first attempt to place *Judges* after *Joshua* came from Greek translators rather than from a Deuteronomistic Historian during the sixth century BCE.

Conclusion

The available evidence suggests that the historical books of the Bible were assembled into a neat succession of eras spanning from Israel's entry into the Promised Land to the destruction of Jerusalem at Alexandria and no earlier. Alexandria did not simply translate the Torah. It organized the others works that were not included in the Law (Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms [Samuel-Kings], Chronicles, Esdras [Ezra-Nehemiah], Tobit) in order to produce the succession of eras that is still visible in modern Bibles that follow the Greek canon. The aim was academic as is demonstrated by all pre-Christian users of the Greek bible (Demetrius, Philo, Josephus), providing historians with sources on Israel's past. Although these books were written in Palestine, Alexandria organized, translated, and canonized them. Hence, Alexandria was the cradle of Jewish historiography.

In such case, the old hypothesis of the Alexandrian canon has to be brought back into the discussion concerning the formation of the historical collection. Put forward in the eighteenth century, this hypothesis understood the LXX as reflecting a pre-Christian canon established at Alexandria and that this canon was older than the

Hebrew canon (Grabe 1715; Sundberg 1964:7–24). This hypothesis was refuted by Albert Sundberg (1964:51–52) because it implies that Alexandria was "a kind of Mecca for non-Palestinian Jews". The time has come to recognize Alexandria as the Medina of biblical canons.

The role of Alexandrian translators, chronographers and canonizers on the present shape of the Bible cannot be overdone. For sure, the Hebrew canon did not accept the Alexandrian Chronography wholesale. It turned its first part into the Former Prophets, and removed Ruth. Nevertheless, the chronographic order of the books was retained; the Alexandrian model was too pervasive to be discarded. Paul McKechnie (2000) has shown that it was most likely from Alexandria that Ben Sira and his grandson worked to uphold the value of the Former Prophets, and thus facilitated their canonization in Jerusalem.

Therefore, the influence of Ptolemy Philadelphos goes far beyond the translation of the Torah. Judging from the lack of interest in the biblical historical books in antiquity,[8] without Philadelphus and the scholars working at his Library, the historical books (nearly half of the OT), may never have been canonized. The common wisdom is that Alexandria translated the historical books because Jerusalem had canonized them. This is based on the assumption that a Deuteronomistic History was produced shortly after 586 BCE and was subsequently canonized in the following centuries, before Ptolemaic times. Against such assumptions, evidence from Alexandria and Qumran points towards a more likely canonization scenario. Jerusalem canonized half of the historical books as Former Prophets because Alexandria had first organized and translated them as a Chronography.

[8] The Samaritans and the Sadducees did not accept them as Scripture. The New Testament never quotes *Joshua* and *Judges*, and only four times from *Kingdoms*, two of which indirectly through the Psalms (2 Kgdms 22:50 through Ps. 27:50 in Rom. 15:9, 2 Kgdms 7:14 through Ps. 2:7 in Heb 1:5. The two direct quotes are 2 Kgdms 7:8.14 in 2 Cor. 6:18 with Heb 1:5 and 3 Kgdms 19:10.14.18 in Rom. 11:3–4). The Mishnah quotes the Torah overwhelmingly and to a certain amount Psalms and Proverbs, but rarely the *Nebiim*. The Tosephta and the Minor Tractates mark a clear difference between Torah scrolls and those of the *Nebiim* in terms of covers and line spacing: Beckwith 1985:113–115.

GENDERING HEALING BOTH HUMAN AND DIVINE: THE CASE OF SIRACH 38:1–15

Elaine M. Wainwright

It is generally agreed that within the health care system of biblical Judaism, healing was depicted as the exclusive work of Israel's God, or what Seybold and Mueller call "Yahweh's healing monopoly,"[1] with the key illustrative text being Exodus 15:26:

> He [God] said, "If you will listen carefully to the voice of the Lord your God, and do what is right in his sight, and give heed to his commandments and keep all his statutes, I will not bring upon you any of the diseases that I brought upon the Egyptians; for *I am the Lord who heals you*" [ὁ ἰώμενός σε].

As with Apollo, in the early Greek tradition, so too the claim is made for Israel's God, "I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal [κἀγὼ ἰάσομαι]" (Deuteronomy 32:39).[2] Life and death, health and illness are entirely in the hands of the divine, with religion and theology providing beliefs about the causes of illnesses and the options available to patients. Israel does not, therefore, seem to have developed the complex health care system that was present in Egypt, Hellenistic Greece and the early Roman Empire.

Hector Avalos, on the other hand, critiques Seybold's analysis and claims that "medical anthropology … has helped us to become aware of the variety of consultation options that were available in ancient health care systems", noting that Israel "had a variety of consultation options."[3] This chapter will briefly explore these claims and counter-

---

[1] K. Seybold and U.B. Mueller, *Sickness and Healing* (Biblical Encounters Series; trans. D.W. Stott; Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), 105.

[2] See also Genesis 20:17; Numbers 12:13; Job 5:18; Isaiah 19:22; 57:18; Jeremiah 30:17, 33:6L. Wells, *The Greek Language of Healing from Homer to New Testament Times* (BZNW 83; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 104. As can be seen by these early examples and as demonstrated by Wells, the verb ἰάομαι characterises this divine healing which is central to the LXX.

[3] H. Avalos, *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East: The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel* (Harvard Semitic Monographs; Atlanta: Scholars Press,

claims in order to develop a context for consideration of Sirach 38:1–15 within biblical Judaism and its health-care system. Particular attention will be given to the gendering of that system and the relationship, if any, with the gendering of the divine. Biblical texts will be considered in the context of Thomas Römer's claim that "[t]he Hebrew Bible is to a large extent a literary product composed by intellectual elites from the Persian period in order to reorganize or even create Judaism out of the crisis of the exile."[4]

Israel's Health Care System and its Gendering

Israel's foundational story, the Exodus, provides a brief glimpse of a possible health care professional in biblical Judaism, namely the midwife/*maia* (Exodus 1:8–21), suggesting that midwives may have been as natural in Israel's health care system as was divine healing power. They are, however, rarely mentioned in the biblical texts, whose authors are predominantly if not exclusively male, and whose concerns were not women's care of women (see Genesis 35:17, 38:28 and 1 Samuel 4:20, outside of Exodus 1:8–21). Hector Avalos says in this regard that "[a]lthough precise statistics are not available, the midwife may have been one of the most ubiquitous health care consultants in the ancient Near East."[5] Evidence for such a claim is supported by the analysis of Nancy Demand who has shown that a number of funerary monuments from the third and fourth centuries BCE across Greece and Anatolia, which were traditionally believed to portray women dying in labour, are, in fact, in recognition of the midwives who were attending the women.[6] Other inscriptional material further affirms the ubiquity, as Avalos calls it, of the midwife as health care consultant, especially

---

1995), 418–419. It should be noted, however, that Avalos too recognises that in Israel's health care system "Yahweh was the only healing deity that could be consulted, and consulting any other deity was a grave offence (245)."

[4] T.C. Römer, "Competing Magicians in Exodus 7–9: Interpreting Magic in the Priestly Theology," in Tood Klutz (ed.), *Magic in the Biblical World: From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon* (JSNTSS 245; London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 13.

[5] Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 280.

[6] N. Demand, "Monuments, Midwives and Gynecology," in Ph.J. van der Eijk, H.F.J. Horstmanshoff and P.H. Schrijvers (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-cultural Context: Papers Read at the Congress Held at Leiden University, 13–15 April, 1992* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), 275–290.

as inscriptions honouring midwives became more common from this period into the first and second centuries of the Common Era.[7] In Egypt also, there is general recognition of women's role as midwives and also as wet-nurses, but these are generally seen as ancillary services to the male physician.[8]

Tal Ilan includes the profession of midwife among the occupations available to the women of Palestine in the Graeco-Roman period, noting that this profession must have been limited to women, since only feminine forms of related words are used in rabbinic literature.[9] She conjectures from this, and also from Josephus' reference to Joseph, son of a ἰατρίνη (*Vita* 185), which she translates as "midwife", that women may have supplemented the knowledge gained in midwifery to enable them to work as physicians also. The inscriptional material from this period in Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, has, however, demonstrated that those designated ἰατρίνη were not simply midwives but were, indeed, physicians, although just exactly what medical tasks they performed is not available to us.[10] Data in this regard in Graeco-Roman Palestine is so scarce, though, that one is left with the image of women's healing functioning almost invisibly in the socio-cultural construction of healing and especially within its semantic and symbolic universes—

---

[7] For further evidence of this, see M.R. Lefkowitz and M.B. Fant (eds.), *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation*[3] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 265–267; §§375–378. For more detailed discussion of this inscriptional material, see E.M. Wainwright, *Women Healing/Healing Women: The Genderisation of Healing in Early Christianity* (London: Equinox, 2006).

[8] B. Watterson, *Women in Ancient Egypt* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 44, makes the general claim that "there must have been midwives without any professional training who had earned good reputations; and these women would presumably have been in great demand." In Jane Rowlandson (ed.), *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 287–289, she claims that "[i]n the third century BC under Ptolemy II Philadelphos, the Greek doctor Herophilos … was the first Greek doctor, so far as we know, to write a book entitled *Midwifery*." See also the reference in this same text to the midwife in *P.Gen* II 103—but this is a later text, AD 147. R.K. Ritner, "Medicine," in D.B. Redford (ed.) *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* (vol. 2, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), notes that "[v]irtually all known medical practitioners are male."

[9] T. Ilan, *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 189.

[10] See H.T. Parker, "Women Doctors in Greece, Rome and the Byzantine Empire," in L.R. Furst (ed.) *Women Healers and Physicians: Climbing the Long Hill* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 131–150; J. Korpela, *Das Medizinalpersonal im Antiken Rom: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 160–166, 179, 190, 205; and Wainwright, *Women Healing/Healing Women*.

despite Ilan's suggestion that women would have been familiar with plants and herbs, and hence could have learnt "which had medicinal uses."[11]

Avalos has noted that in Israel, as in the Graeco-Roman world, the home is a primary locus of health care.[12] This is seen in the story of the Shunammite woman and her son, who becomes grievously ill and is returned to the house by his father (2 Kings 4:8–37), and in the story of Amnon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13). Women's care of those ill in the home seems to be assumed to be a natural occurrence, to Tamar's detriment when she is raped by her brother Amnon—who is supposedly ill—when she brings to his sick room the cakes he requested. Adrien Janis Bledstein suggests, on the basis of an extensive examination of healing or divination rituals known from ancient Near Eastern texts, that Tamar may have been performing a healing ritual in a way that was entirely acceptable and hence she had no cause for alarm when requested to bring cakes to Amnon.[13] The popular arena was, therefore, an arena in which women's healing skills could be wrought. These were skills with the medicinal use of herbs as noted above; skills gained through midwifery which may have approached those skills and arts exercised by the ἰατρίνη of professional medicine; or through religious rituals which were in place but were condemned by Israel's official theologians.

That both women and men were engaged in the area of folk healing involving religious or magical arts and rituals in biblical Judaism is evident to us by way of prohibition which parallels the stereotyping of these same arts among women in particular in the literature of Greece and Rome.[14] The prohibition of Deuteronomy 18:10 (cf. 18:9–14), is more explicitly gendered in Exodus 22:18, "You shall not permit a female sorcerer to live." Saul expels all the mediums and the wizards from the land (1 Samuel 28:3) but then goes to consult the "woman who is a medium" at Endor (1 Samuel 28:7). Ezekiel (13:17–23; also Jeremiah 44:15–30) speaks out against women who seem to be engaged in some form of magical activity involving wrist bands and veils (and for Jeremiah, cakes offered to the queen of heaven), proclaiming that

[11] Ilan, *Jewish Women*, 189. 1 Enoch 8:3 attributes such knowledge to the work of the fallen angel Amastras.

[12] Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 251–253.

[13] A.J. Bledstein, "Was HABBIRYÂ a Healing Ritual Performed by a Woman in King David's House?" *BR* 37 (1992): 15–31.

[14] See the lengthy discussion of this in Wainwright, *Women Healing/Healing Women*.

God will save God's people from their hands. The construction of the health care system allows for God alone as healer, and fidelity to God's covenant as a grounds for health, while the presence and activity of those who might also have been engaged in healing rituals is prohibited by prescription or by stereotype, especially those who are female.

Such prohibition, however, raises questions in relation to these women of undefined power or wisdom (the medium of Endor of 1 Samuel 28:7; and the wise women of Tekoa and Abel-beth-maacah of 2 Samuel 14:2 and 20:16). They were women who held power and whose power enabled them to function in the public arena, outside their homes. This leads Phyllis Bird to speculate that "[i]t is likely that many of the specialized roles and activities of women outside the home or involving public recognition and action … were performed by older women no longer burdened by the care of small children."[15] Given that women would have been engaged in the healing of children and family members in their home, we can at least suggest that some of the wisdom and leadership they brought to the public arena in their later years was that of healing.

Formally, however, within Israel generally, the only ones who seem to be the legitimate agents of divine healing are the prophets or the 'man of God' as the prophet is sometimes called (1 Kings 17:24 and passim).[16] Elijah and Elisha both carry out healing functions on God's behalf. Elijah restores life to the son of the widow of Zarephath in her home (1 Kings 17:17–24) and an unnamed man of God restores the withered hand of Jeroboam in the sanctuary of Bethel, a place of prophetic contestation not a healing sanctuary (1 Kings 13:1–6). Elisha likewise restores life to the young son of the Shunammite woman in her home (2 Kings 4:8–37) and heals the leprosy of Naaman (2 Kings 5:1–19). Of this latter healing, Avalos says in relation to its meaning making function within Israel's health care system that "obedience to Yahweh and his authentic prophet, not a routine prescription, is the determinant of therapeutic efficacy."[17] He contrasts this with the "theology of Asclepius which placed a high value on the temple locus because the god could not be everywhere within a large geographic

[15] Ph. Bird, *Missing Persons and Mistaken Identities: Women and Gender in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 60.

[16] For a more extensive discussion of this aspect of Israel's health care system see Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 260–277.

[17] Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 265.

area."[18] Isaiah too seems to enact a healing role similar to that of an ancient physician in relation to Hezekiah in his illness (Isaiah 38:21) and like the healing acts of Elijah and Elisha, it is separate from cultic activity and location.

Women seem to be excluded from the role of prophet as healing intermediary, although a few women are given the title of prophet. Miriam is named such and engages with other women in cultic dance and proclamation (Exodus 15:20–21). Deborah too is called prophet (Judges 4:4), but she acts as judge in Israel without any accounts of healing activity. Huldah provides a typical prophetic proclamation in response to the consultation of the priest Hilkiah and his companions (2 Kings 22:14–20) and Noadiah is simply called prophet (Nehemiah 6:14). Once again, women are visible in leadership roles in the public arena but healing roles are not ascribed to them as they are ascribed but rarely to their male counterparts who are prophets.

During the period of the formation of Israel's biblical traditions into coherent narratives during the Persian and Hellenistic periods, professional medicine was developing in Hellenistic Greece alongside the rise of the religion of Asclepius. In Egypt also, which had a long tradition of *swnw* reaching back to Pharaonic Egypt, it seems that as J. Worth Estes claims, "… the *swnw* had developed a sufficiently strong sense of professional self-identification by the sixth century B.C. that they finally came to feel they deserved their own divine patron."[19] And so the apotheosis of Imhotep, the vizier of Zoser, and the growing significance of the professional healer in Egypt, parallel the rise of Hippocratic medicine and the significance of the Asclepium in Greece and the Hellenistic world.[20] Given the centrality of Israel's theology of God as healer with itinerant prophets acting on God's behalf as healer on rare occasions, however, there is little evidence of professional medical personnel presented positively in Israel, male or female. Jeremiah 17:14 reiterates the claim that healing belongs to God "Heal me, O God, and I shall be healed" and Jeremiah 30:17 promises "I shall restore your health and I shall heal your wounds". Jeremiah 8:22 asks the somewhat sarcastic rhetorical question "Is there

[18] Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 265–266.

[19] J.W. Estes, *The Medical Skills of Ancient Egypt* (Canton: Science History Publications, 1989), 125.

[20] See J.B. Hurry, *Imhotep: The Vizier and Physician of King Zoser and afterwards the Egyptian God of Medicine*[2] (London: Humphrey Milford: 1928), 169–180.

no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician [ἰατρὸς] there? Why then has the health of my poor people not been restored?" Both physicians and healing materials such as balsam are decried as equally ineffective in the face of God's healing power. Only the leaves of the trees that grow by the river flowing out of the restored temple (Ezekiel 47:12) escape the condemnation of Israel's theologians, and these because they are connected to the cultus through which God's healing powers function. There is little room here for an ecological reading of the *materia medica* unless one reads against the grain of the biblical text, in order that the rich material resources for healing hidden within the text can be uncovered together with those who worked with them, some of whom may have been women as suggested earlier.[21]

Another text which contributes further to Israel's construction of the physician as a danger to its theology of healing is 2 Chronicles 16:12: "Asa was diseased in his feet, and his disease became severe; yet even in his disease he did not seek God, but sought help from physicians [ἰατρούς]." Tobit too consults with physicians (Tobit 2:10), but even though they treat his eyes with ointments [φάρμακα], they are unable to heal him and he becomes totally blind. There is a strong tradition, therefore, within Israel's health care system of negating the role of the physician and his materials in a way which differs from the surrounding Hellenistic and Egyptian worlds, in which divine healing and the work of the physician co-existed. This does not mean, however, that there were not physicians or a rich tradition of *pharmaka* or *materia medica* in Israel. Our investigations to date have uncovered hints that may point to a richer stream of healing tradition and healing personnel below the surface of the biblical narrative. The constant biblical theme of proclaiming their illegitimacy points to their presence and their function in biblical Judaism. There seems, however to be a slight indication of a change in this theology, with the decline of the prophet in the Second Temple period.[22]

---

[21] Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 290, in light of not only Jeremiah 8:22 but also 46:11 and 51:8–9, suggests that Gilead "was a center for medicinal resins such as balsam"…and that the physicians of Gilead "were famous for their knowledge of these medicaments." Estes, *Medical Skills of Ancient Egypt*, gives an extensive "Glossary of Drug Substances," 139–157.

[22] Avalos, *Illness and Health Care*, 298.

Enter Sirach 38:1–15

By the mid-Hellenistic period, the Testament of Job 38:7–8[23] and Sirach 38:1–15 recognise physicians and their healing power as well as the *pharmaka* or *materia medica* with which they worked. Let me turn, therefore, to a consideration of Sirach 38:1–15.

The Greek text contained in the LXX known as Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira is generally believed to be a translation of a Hebrew text written by the translator's grandfather in Jerusalem, probably for a scribal school which he headed, between 190 and 180 BCE, just after the high priesthood of Simon from 219–196 BCE.[24] Israel, at this time, was under Seleucid rule, but Ben Sira would, no doubt have also known the Ptolemaic control over Syria/Palestine up to approximately 200 BCE. Paul McKechnie has argued quite persuasively, however, in a recent article,[25] contrary to the dominant opinion and predominantly on the basis of the I-passages, that the original Hebrew text was written in Egypt to which Ben Sira traveled around 200 BCE. I will take account of the import of both locations in what follows.

There is no disagreement, however, that the translation of Ben Sira's Hebrew text was carried out by his grandson in Egypt to which he came in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes according to the prologue to his translation, namely around 132 BCE, his translation being completed, many believe, around 117 BCE or at least some years

---

[23] The *Testament of Job* is a later work, probably from the first century BCE or CE. The brief reference there in 38:7–8 may well reflect Sirach 38:1–15: "My healing and my treatment are from the Lord, who also created the physicians." See "Testament of Job (First Century B.C.-First Century A.D.): A New Translation and Introduction by R.P. Spittler," in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (vol. 1, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983), 829–868.

[24] This is the position claimed by M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (vol. 1; trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 1974), 131–138; D. Harrington, "Sirach Research since 1965," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 170–171, discusses Th. Middendorp and H. Stadelmann, both of whom locate the work of Ben Sira in Jerusalem as does Harrington himself in "Sirach," in *The International Bible Commentary: a Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. W.R. Farmer (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 923, where he states that Ben Sira conducted a school in Jerusalem. Many other scholars also hold to this position which is the majority one.

[25] P. McKechnie, "The Career of Joshua Ben Sira" *JTS* 51.1 (2000): 3–26.

after 132 BCE. The Greek text has been the dominant canonical one, but substantial parts of the Hebrew text have been recovered during the last century from the Cairo Geniza, at Masada and at Qumran.[26]

There seems to be a general scholarly agreement that Ben Sira tries to integrate, for his students, traditional Jewish beliefs with international wisdom traditions and Hellenistic perspectives.[27] The section on physicians and *pharmaka* participates in this aspect of the work but it stands uniquely in the text in that no other parts of Ben Sira's collection deal with this same topic whereas all his other topics like creation, death, happiness, justice, wisdom and women are scattered across various segments of the book.[28]

Sirach 38:1–3 opens the section under consideration with an imperative to honour the physician [τίμα ἰατρὸν], a very significant shift from the suspicion and condemnation in other parts of the biblical tradition seen above. The Greek text gives the reason: because God has created him.[29] The Hebrew, however, which Noorda favours as Ben Sira's original, contains the verb חלק which is best translated 'to appoint' or 'to assign'.[30] The physician is to be honoured because God has assigned him to his task. Verse 2 gives the reason for the honour: first his wisdom [Hebrew text] or his gift of healing [ἴασις LXX] come from God and he receives rewards from the king. McKechnie, in arguing for Ben Sira's writing in Egypt, plays out the arguments which demonstrate that references to the king do not alone help to determine context but the long tradition of physicians in Egypt together with their growing public recognition in Hellenistic Greece, would suggest Alexandria as a more

---

[26] A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 50–62 for a discussion of "The Original Hebrew Text and Ancient Versions" and Harrington, "Sirach", 923.

[27] See Harrington, "Sirach", 923; and J. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 184.

[28] See for instance Harrington's list, "Sirach", 924. Note, however, the passing reference to a physician at 10:10 and the reference to visiting the sick at 7:35. J.T. Sanders, *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (SBLMS 28; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 75, discusses the possible influence on the author of the Egyptian health care perspective in which physicians had long been significant.

[29] The Greek text uses the masculine singular -πρὸς τὰς χρείας. I will retain this (although the NRSV translation uses the plural) in order to convey the gendering of this text by ben Sira.

[30] S. Noorda, "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing: The Connection of Medical Treatment and Religious Beliefs in Ben Sira 38, 1–15" in M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans L'Empire Romain 78; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 219.

favourable context for the honouring of the physician by the king than Seleucid-controlled Jerusalem.[31]

In the opening verses, the physician is doubly honoured and the gifts of healing and wisdom are intimately linked. Earlier, the author of Proverbs proposed a tradition of wisdom as source of life and holiness in distinction to the temple and cultus,[32] but the very general references there to life and healing are not sufficient to point to the healing art, the ἴασις of the professional medical practitioner that we find here in Sirach 38. They do, however, provide fertile ground in which this tradition could be developed. Verse 3 continues the honouring process, recognizing the skill [ἐπιστήμη] of the physician, or the knowledge according to the Hebrew text, a gift which Sirach 1:19 recognises as being rained down from Sophia, female gestalt of Israel's divine Wisdom.[33] As well as being rewarded by kings (v. 2), the physician will also be admired by the great (v. 3). Given the significance of honour in Mediterranean society generally and in the book of Sirach in particular, as Claudia Camp has demonstrated,[34] this opening exaltation of the physician is quite significant and might give us an insight into Ben Sira's purpose, namely the establishing of the tradition of professional medicine which had been considered illegitimate in biblical Judaism's dominant theological tradition not only within the divine realm but also the human. Physicians are honoured by God as well as by kings and noble or great men.

Verses 4–8 turn to the praise of *pharmaka* which God created out of the earth (v. 4). The symbolic universe of the centrality of Israel's God

---

[31] McKechnie, "Career", 9–15.

[32] See R.E. Clements, *Wisdom for a Changing World: Wisdom in Old Testament Theology* (Berkeley Lectures 2; Berkeley: Bibal Press, 1990), 37–55, argues for an alternative tradition of healing in Proverbs, especially 1–9, but the texts he cites are very general with reference to life and wholeness and are, therefore, not sufficiently strong to indicate an alternative to the strong tradition already seen of healing belonging in the hands of God and fidelity to the covenant being the constitutive element in Israel's health care system. Two passing references earlier in Sirach may also belong to this faint but developing tradition when Sirach, advised in relation to health to take care of it before becoming ill (Sira 18:19) and praised health as more valuable than riches (Sira 30:15).

[33] See E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*[2] (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 132–133, in relation to such a designation of Wisdom.

[34] C.V. Camp, "Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem through the Eyes of Ben Sira" in A.-J. Levine (ed.), *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman Period* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 1; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991), 1–39.

to the healing process is not being undermined, but into this universe both the healing art of the physician and the power of the fruits of the earth are being included as sources of healing—contrary to their prior exclusion from Israel's health care system. Ben Sira uses the example from Exodus 15:23–25 (v. 5), in which Moses was commanded to throw a piece of wood into the bitter waters of Marah, and the water was made sweet. Grandfather and grandson as well as subsequent scholars differ over how to attribute the power which changed the water: to properties of the wood as the NRSV translation of the LXX does; or to God as Noorda reads the Hebrew ms B text.[35] It is rather ironical, but perhaps an irony not missed by Ben Sira, that this text immediately precedes the central affirmation of Israel's exclusive position in relation to healing in Exodus 15:26:

> If you will listen carefully to the voice of the Lord your God, and do what is right in his sight, and give heed to his commandments and keep all his statutes, I will not bring upon you any of the diseases that I brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord who heals you.

As the verses of Ben Sira continue, the interrelationship between the healing work of God, the skill of the physician and the healing effect of the fruits of the earth [*pharmaka*] is highlighted:

> God gave skill to human beings
> That they might be glorified in God's marvellous works
> By them the physician heals and takes away pain;
> The pharmacist makes a mixture from them.
> God's works will never be finished;
> And from God health spreads over all the earth. (Sir 38:6–8)

Ben Sira has made a very strong case with his students for the wisdom of the professional healing role of those named physicians, and the significance of *pharmaka* in the healing process, all within the context of the centrality of the healing power of the God of Israel. These elements were common within the Hellenistic world, as is evident from inscriptions which abound recognizing physicians, from the Hippocratic writings which were emerging at this time and from works such as those of Theophrastus of Eresus on Lesbos (c. 370–288 BCE) who devoted almost sixty years of study to his multiple-volume works *History of Plants* and *Inquiry into Plants*. Egypt also had a long and vibrant tradition of

[35] Noorda, "Illness and Sin," 219 n. 14.

botanical and pharmaceutical cures for illness—much longer, in fact than Greece.[36] Ben Sira's reflections could therefore have emerged from either a Jerusalem wisdom school seeking to combine Hellenistic medical wisdom with Israel's cultic theology or from Ptolemaic Alexandria where Hellenistic and Egyptian professional and folk medicine met.

The second stanza, Sirach 38:9–15, one could imagine as a response of Ben Sira to a student or students who may have been shocked by the wisdom their teacher was proposing in the first half of the text. The author moves as it were through the traditional Jewish beliefs in vv. 9–11.[37] Verse 9 counsels prayer whose outcome will be healing from God; verse 10, righteous living and avoidance of sin; verse 11, the cultus, including sacrificial offerings. This is the world with which the students would have been familiar from "the reading of the Law and the Prophets and the other books of [the] ancestors," for devotion to which Ben Sira's grandson praises his grandfather in the Prologue to the book. Within this health care schema, Ben Sira reiterates again, the physician must be given a place [δὸς τόπον], a place of honour, one might presume, when the second half of v. 12 reiterates the LXX rendering of v. 1b—God has created him [αὐτὸν ἔκτισεν κύριος] who is to be honoured (38:1a). Verses 13–14 draw the physician and his healing into Israel's God-centred universe. The physician can, indeed, bring healing, but like the patient, he ought to pray so that his diagnosis would be right for the sake of healing and preserving life. Verse 15 forms an inclusio with v. 1 around the poem, ending with reference to the physician as v. 1 began, but the obverse: as v. 1 called for the physician to be honoured, v. 15 notes that the sinner will be defiant toward him. The physician in Ben Sira's schema belongs legitimately to Israel's symbolic universe of healing in contrast to the sinner who places himself among the illegitimate where the physician has been in Judaism's earlier theologizing. Ben Sira draws the wisdom of the emerging medical sciences, presumably as encountered in the influence

---

[36] See di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 442; J.F. Nunn, *Ancient Egyptian Medicine* (London: British Museum Press, 1996), 24–41 and 136–162, which discusses the drug therapy evidenced in the ancient medical papyri as well as other sources; and Estes, *Medical Skills of Ancient Egypt*, 136–157, for an account of the *materia medica* of Pharaonic Egypt. A later sage, namely the author of *The Wisdom of Solomon* 16:12, seems to deny the efficacy of "herb and poultice" but this is related to a very specific incident rather than healing generally. Note too that we have already drawn attention to the prophetic healing role of Isaiah who applies a fig poultice to Hezekiah's sore (Isaiah 38:21).

[37] Noorda, "Illness and Sin" 220 n. 16.

of Hellenism and, in all probability, Egypt, into Judaism's theological world view.[38]

The physician in this text is gendered male, but whether this is intended as generic or whether the role of physician is reserved for men in the mind of Ben Sira is not absolutely clear. It could be argued, however, that the symbolic universe of Israel's healing dominated by a single male divinity seems to conspire with Ben Sira's portrayal of women according to the degree of honour or shame they bring to the male (see for instance Sirach 23:22–26; 25:16–26:18; 36:26–31 on wives; and 7:24–25; 22:3–5; 26:10–12 and 42:9–14 on daughters)[39] to continue the tradition in Israel of giving no official public space to those female healers who, we have already argued, may have been exercising their healing arts not only in private but subtly through their public roles.

Gendering Divine Healing

When looking to the relationship between the gendering of divine healing and women's role in this arena, Tikva Frymer-Kensky's words provide a guide as well as a warning:

> When modeling is done by the divine, the modeling does not simply illustrate; it authorizes and approves what it models. This is a powerful two-edged sword. On the one hand, divine modeling for women's family roles gives women esteem within these roles so that these roles become a source of self-satisfaction and nourishment. On the other hand, this same divine modeling makes cultural attitudes and stereotypes part of the realm of the sacred, lending powerful support to these attitudes and inhibiting change.[40]

If we take this into the realm of women's participation in public professions and divine modeling of female healing, one could expect that the presence of female divine healers might be seen to be modeling women's participation in healing professions—but such is not the case. Women are described as midwives as well as physicians on inscriptions

---

[38] Noorda, "Illness and Sin" 224, who makes this more specific by suggesting that ideas such as those contained in the Hippocratic treatise, *De Morbo Sacro*, might have provided a model which lead Ben Sira to "a positive appreciation of medical science."

[39] See in detail Camp, "Understanding a Patriarchy".

[40] T. Frymer-Kensky, *In the Wake of the Goddesses: Women, Culture, and the Biblical Transformation of Pagan Myth* (New York: Free Press, 1992), 25.

across Anatolia and Greece and their healing facility with herbs and all manner of *pharmaka* is stereotyped in classical literature. They are healers, therefore, in the professional and folk areas of healing, but the religious realm is dominated by Asclepius and male priests/physicians. The presence and participation of Hygieia and Isis in divine healing seems to have little relationship to women exercising healing roles in Greece. These women healers do not function in any explicit way in the religious arena. The presence of Hygieia may, however, have modelled and authorised female healing in very subtle ways. Her presence may not have explicitly modeled women healing but given that professional women healers emerged in the public arena during the time when women were becoming more active in numerous public professions, her presence may have authorised their cultural participation along with other sanctioning processes. Perhaps the constant presence of Hygieia with Asklepius is one way in which we might account for the equal number of women dedicants as men at the Athenian Asclepieum as well as the significant number of women who frequented Epidauros and, even though records are not available to us, we might assume equally at other shrines such as Kos, Pergamum, Olympia, and Corinth. Compton says in this regard that "like other male-female deity pairings", the presence of Hygieia with Asclepius may have made the sanctuaries "more approachable for women seeking divine aid."[41] That the first known supplicant of Hygieia was male, Perikles, and that women dedicants and women healed acknowledge Asclepius' healing power, warns us, though, to avoid too static a gender distinction within the divine-human nexus of healing.

In Egypt, which had a longer tradition of professional medicine than Greece, as well as female deities of healing such as Sekhmet, Selqet and Isis, there is, as in Israel, almost no evidence of women in professional medicine.[42] Estes notes the reference to Peseshet who lived in the Old Kingdom and who was said to be "Lady Overseer of Lady physicians". Her presence suggests other women practising medicine also, but to date no evidence of such women is available.[43] There is only one other explicit reference to a woman physician in ancient Egypt and that is Tawe who is named in an early Ptolemaic

[41] M.T. Compton, "The Association of Hygieia with Asklepios in Graeco-Roman Asklepieion Medicine" *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 57 (2002): 322.

[42] Ritner, "Medicine" 353.

[43] See Ritner "Medicine" 353.

papyrus.[44] Barbara Watterson notes that there were five professions open to Egyptian women: priesthood, midwifery, mourning, dancing and music;[45] and Jane Rowlandson's sourcebook for women in Greek and Roman society which yields a wider range of public activities for women still gives no account which would point to their being public healers.[46] We noted earlier, however, that by the Ptolemaic period in Egypt, Imhotep had assumed a place in Egypt's pantheon similar to that of Asclepius in the Greek pantheon: each dominated the healing role. The role of other divine healers, male or female, was secondary.

Even though recent feminist scholarship has provided glimpses of the silenced female divine in Israel's symbolic universe, especially as Sophia,[47] she does not function as one of a pair with Israel's God as Healer as does Hygieia, nor is healing a sole or even a significant quality associated with her or other female deity condemned in Israel's scriptures.[48] Divine and human healing in biblical Judaism is gendered predominantly male in the texts available to us.

---

[44] Estes, *Medical Skills of Ancient Egypt*, 21.

[45] Watterson, *Women in Ancient Egypt*, 38.

[46] Rowlandson (ed.), *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Similarly, S.B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Shocken, 1975), who takes account of women in Hellenistic Egypt, has no reference to women physicians in this context.

[47] E.A. Johnson, *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse* (New York: Crossroad, 1992); J.E. McKinlay, *Gendering Wisdom the Host: Biblical Invitations to Eat and Drink* (JSOTSS 216; Gender, Culture, Theory 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); and S. Schroer, *Wisdom Has Built Her House: Studies on the Figure of Sophia in the Bible* (trans. L.M. Moloney and W. McDonough; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000) are among those who explore the female gestalt of the divine in the figure of Sophia/Wisdom. O. Keel and C. Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel* (trans. T.H. Trapp; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), provide the most extensive study of the imaging of the divine in Israel to date and the only link they offer to a female divine healer is that health may have been one of the areas of responsibility of the "Queen of Heaven" to whom the women offer libations and cakes in Jeremiah 44:15–19, see §339.

[48] Although she is said to save in Wisdom 9:18, Sophia is not named as Saviour as was Hygieia nor is healing, as we have explored it in this work, a specific characteristic associated with her despite the influence of the religion of Isis on the characterization of Sophia. See Schroer, *Wisdom Has Built Her House*, 104–107.

Conclusion

In the world whose wisdom, both divine and practical, Ben Sira seeks to introduce into biblical Judaism, healing is strongly gendered male except for inscriptional and literary evidence in Hellenistic Greece. Ben Sira has succeeded in adding more complexity to Israel's health care system during the second century BCE, and given legitimacy to the work of physicians which was previously considered illegitimate. He has not, however, extended this to the gendering of the system either in the divine or the human realm.

SECTION EPSILON

… AND WITH ZEUS MAKE END, YE MUSES

INNOVATIONS IN ANCIENT GARB? HIEROGLYPHIC TEXTS FROM THE TIME OF PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS*

Joachim Friedrich Quack

When, in the aftermath of the conquests of Alexander the Great, his generals divided the empire, Egypt fell to Ptolemy, son of Lagos. He and his successors[1] had to cope with the fact that they were a minority ruling in a populous country with an enormous indigenous cultural tradition. It was an obvious necessity to adapt to that cultural tradition. So it is logical that the involvement of the Greek dynasty with indigenous language and writing was considerably more intense in Egypt than elsewhere. This is evident in the enormous number of Egyptian-language official inscriptions in the Ptolemaic period.

For Ptolemy II, the case is remarkable. We have several highly important historical inscriptions of his time, stylised as official royal declarations, in purely hieroglyphic form, without any Greek version. This should be pointed out all the more because, from Ptolemy III onward, the high actions of the state were declared mostly in the synodal decrees, and these are mostly trilingual—hieroglyphic, demotic and Greek; sometimes, especially the later ones, only hieroglyphic and demotic. The language of the inscriptions in question strives for imitation of the classical Middle Egyptian language, even if often falling short of its goal and visibly influenced by the spoken idiom of the time.[2]

It is clearly not possible in this brief chapter to go into the details of every hieroglyphic inscription from this period. Quite a few, indeed, concern only the ordinary cultic activities. They present Ptolemy II in a way typical of an Egyptian pharaoh caring for the cult of the gods.[3] Although this is in itself a not unimportant fact, the historical value of

---

* Kurt Sethe, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1904) = *Urkunden*.

[1] For recent histories of their times see Hölbl 1994 and Huss 2001.

[2] For the language, see Engsheden 2003.

[3] See e.g. George 1982, Sambin and Carlotti 1995, Sambin 1995, Thiers 1997, Vassilika 1989, 27–38.

any individual instance of this kind is very slight. The most important are probably those which show Ptolemy II in adoration before his divinised dead sister and wife, Arsinoe II.[4] Instead of listing all this in detail, I will go into the specific longer inscriptions which tend actually to describe historic events.

The first text I will discuss in detail is the famous and well-known stela of Mendes (*Urkunden* II, 28–54), so called after its find-spot.[5] It has a well-preserved lunette showing the king, the queen and the king's son before the actual living goat of Mendes, the child-god Harpokrates, the deity goat of Mendes, the goddess Hat-Mehit, and finally Arsinoe II as goddess.

The text proper starts with a eulogy of the king, who is declared to be beloved of the Ba of Mendes, a god in goat form. This takes about six of the twenty-eight lines of the main text. After this traditional and rather stereotyped introduction, we pass to actual narration. Unfortunately, the first date in the text is not preserved. We can suppose that it was to the very beginning of Philadelphus' reign, because it mentions that the king came to the sacred goat of Mendes in order to beg life and kingship from him. This encounter of king and sacred animal is told explicitly as being the first occasion on which the king encountered a sacred animal after ascending the throne. The text insists on the fact that the other gods came only afterwards, and that the action was in accordance with what kings had done before. It describes the ritual action in some detail and stresses that it was done according to traditional writings. The insistence on the ancient models makes it all the more surprising that we do not actually know of any older stela where an Egyptian king makes a similar pilgrimage to a sacred animal.

Afterwards, the king restores a temple building from damage done by rebellious foreign countries and establishes his rules for the cult in accordance with the writings of Thot. After returning to his residence Alexandria, the next fact narrated is that he married his sister Arsinoe; it is described how her titles are fixed. No new date is given, although the marriage took place at the earliest in 279 BC, about three years after the beginning of the sole reign of Philadelphus, and perhaps even as late as 274 BC.[6] Restoring monuments is, of course, a quintessential

[4] Quaegebeur 1971.

[5] Modern translations at Roeder 1959, 168–188, and de Meulenaere and MacKay 1976, 173–177 (lacking most of the last line of the text).

[6] See Huss 2001, 307 and Thiers, 'Le mariage divin'.

action of any Egyptian king. The actual description of the marriage within the framework of a stela, however, does not really seem very usual according to Egyptian norms. Even the well-known so-called marriage scarab of Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye[7] does not really describe the marriage: it only presents the fact of her being the queen, and her ancestry. The most pertinent parallels are probably the marriage-stelae of Ramses II[8] describing his marriages to two Hittite princesses, and that had been a relatively unusual constellation.

In our case, the quite problematic background of this marriage might have made it necessary to proclaim it a bit louder than usual, perhaps connected with the fact that the later divinisation of Arsinoe II plays a prominent role in the text. Here, a new date intervenes: regnal year fifteen, first month of summer, when the queen dies (270 BC). She gets a ceremonial opening of the mouth[9] according to Egyptian custom—but it is equally unusual to mention that on a historical stela. The proper place to document such a ceremony according to traditional Egyptian usage would have been in the decoration of a tomb. Perhaps it is most significant that the very instant of the Mendes stela was specifically cited in the seminal study of the ritual of the opening of the mouth, simply because it is such a rare case where the actual enactment and the duration of four days is given. Funerary rites of an Egyptian type are enacted for her, as for other male and female gods.

The king sets out a decree, which meets the approval of the priests, to the effect that, given the acts of Arsinoe towards gods and men, her statue should be made to appear in Mendes beside that of the local god, and also that cult images of her should be made in every nome of Egypt, with a cult name of "the one beloved of the goat, the goddess who loves her brother, Arsinoe".

With this act, we enter in principle well-known Egyptian territory. Divinisation of human beings in gratitude for their extraordinary merits had been known for a long time, beginning about late Old Kingdom.[10] But most cases are not attested as being due to royal decree. The act of Philadelphus for his dead wife should not, of course, be seen in isolation. We know that he also deified his father, and that he had

[7] Blankenberg-Van Delden 1969, 4–7, 16 and 21–56.
[8] New edition KRI II 233, 5–257, 16 and 282, 1–284, 1.
[9] Otto 1960, II, 28.
[10] A global study by A. von Lieven is in preparation.

already decreed a cult of himself and his wife as *theoi adelphoi*, effectively laying the ground for a cult of reigning Ptolemaic rulers as gods.[11]

More problematic is the next item told to us. King Ptolemy selected Egyptian natives to act as recruits for his army. It is stressed in the text that the king loved Egypt more than any country serving him, and that he trusted the Egyptians, Obviously, such a note is only understandable in the new situation of the Macedonian conquest—it would be most surprising if any indigenous pharaoh had felt any necessity to stress his choice of Egyptian troops.[12] There is, however, a contrary interpretation, which prefers to see a reference not to indigenous Egyptians but to the recruitment simply of Greeks born in Egypt.[13] I, however, fail to see why such an act would be worth mentioning, especially in a text written in the Egyptian language.[14]

The following items concern tax reductions or exemptions. Specifically, the ferry toll and the bread tax[15] are cancelled for the region of the Mendesian nome. This is justified by some age-old custom—in the case of the bread tax, even by a decree issued by Thot at the order of Re for all future kings. This is nicely posed by introducing a citation from the much older *Hymn to the Inundation*.[16] For all of the country, the king decides to reduce the amount of taxes paid. The amount per year is given as more than six hundred thousand deben, at least 5460 kg. Such tax exemptions are quite frequent already in earlier times for specific temples, but I cannot see any reduction for the whole country being proclaimed this way.

The next measure narrated is the excavation of an artificial canal in order to protect the eastern border of Egypt. We will hear more about it in connection with the Pithom stela.

---

[11] Huss 2001, 325; Minas 2000.

[12] The case of Ramesses II who chides his troops after the battle of Kadesh and stresses that he had trusted them is, of course, of a quite different nature.

[13] Derchain 1986, 203–204.

[14] Lloyd 2002 amasses at 120–122 evidence that already in the third century Egyptians were participating in the Ptolemaic military.

[15] The expression *pꜣ ṯnỉ n ỉḫ* causes some difficulty in understanding. Earlier translators have understood it as "Hälfte des Einkommens" (Sethe, Urkunden II, p. 43), "Anteil der Abgaben" (Roeder 1959, 183) or "revenues alimentaires" (de Meulenaere 1976, 175). It can hardly be doubted that the first part is the masculine noun *pꜣ ṯnỉ* "the tax", for which see Erichsen 1954, 639. Unfortunately, there seems to be no demotic attestation of such a tax, and no Greek expression which could be a likely correspondant.

[16] Recognised by Peter Seibert (1967, 100 n. 102).

Finally, a new date—in this case, regnal year twenty-one introduces a new section. The restoration of the temple of the he-goat of Mendes is finished, and its inscription tells the name of the king as well as his father and the brother-loving queen Arsinoe. A great inauguration-festival is celebrated, and the god introduced into his house. The festival is directed by the son of the king. It is enacted country-wide. Afterwards, some class of people (probably mentioned in a lacuna) goes to the residence in order to pay homage to the king, and the prophets follow them, bringing wreaths and amulets to the king. He and his clothes are anointed, and the same happens for the king's children.

The next date is unfortunately not preserved in the text, but it can still be seen that it was precise at least to the month-indication. It is reported to the king that a living goat has been found and should be installed as god by the king. As is proposed, the king sends to all main temples of the land for the staff of the scriptorium. The competent Egyptian specialists recognise that the animal has the correct shape according to the traditional writings, so it is really recognised, enthroned and given a title. This is actually one of relatively few cases where an Egyptian text confirms what we know from Greek writers, namely that a sacred animal is recognised by specific bodily marks. Although we can suppose that recognising sacred animals had always been an official act, we have no pre-Ptolemaic text at all describing how the king was involved in such decisions. I will come back to this matter in my general discussion.

Furthermore, the king devises a plan which is introduced as not having been made by any king before him: he lets statues appear and be brought to the Mendesian nome by a delegation of prophets, priests, dignitaries and military leaders—unfortunately, the stela is broken exactly at this place, but what is still recognisable is that a statue of Arsinoe was part of the ensemble, and perhaps also one of the goat: at least, that would tally with the depiction in the lunette of the stela.

The exact date of arrival, the sixteenth day of the second month of spring, is indicated—and this is the occasion for a great festival. Perhaps it should be noted that nowhere in the text is the personal attendance of the king mentioned. Therefore his depiction in the lunette of the stela before the newly-found goat is as unreal as that of the long-dead Queen Arsinoe. He was present at Mendes only once, at the beginning of his reign, and his queen probably never. Ptolemy the Son who appears behind them was there for the inauguration of the restored temple, but for the introduction of the statues, none of the three seems to have

been present in person—only a high-ranking delegation of courtiers and priests. Compared to pharaonic precedents, that seems a bit like a devaluation of the Egyptian cult.

The text concludes with the idea that in return for his benefactions, the king may expect a long and stable rule, and the succession of his son(s) forever—a quite typical Egyptian idea. I will come back to some especially pertinent questions later, but already now some conclusions are appropriate. The inscription plays at the same time on two seemingly mutually exclusive ideas, to wit, the following of established traditional norms, and innovation by doing things which have never been done before. Strange as it might seem, both of these are well rooted in the traditional Egyptian phraseology.[17] Innovation is accepted, and even actually encouraged, if it can be presented as an improvement—especially one involving more piety towards the gods, or greater constructions of buildings. Still, the text has some innovations not marked as such, and even where ancient models are cited, we sometimes fail to corroborate them.

Probably more discussed in recent times is another stela of this period, the stela of Pithom (*Urkunden* II, 81–105), named after its find-spot in the eastern Delta.[18] The stela has a rather bad epigraphy, with many signs distorted or difficult to read, and this is responsible for some controversies about its interpretation. A lot of the discussion has centred on calendrical questions and problems of exact date.[19]

The lunette is divided in two parts. The right one shows the king offering Maat before five gods: Atum, Osiris, Horus, Isis and Queen Arsinoe II. The left one is in itself divided. On the outside, an Udjat-eye is presented before a god whose identity has been somewhat debated: probably it is Harsomtus.[20] In the inner area, the king presents wine before Atum and Isis. Like the Mendes stela, the inscription sets out with the titles and a stereotyped eulogy of the king. Here also, it takes about six of the twenty-eight lines of the main text, so that the proportions are quite similar to those of the Mendes stela.

The first event described takes place in regnal year six of the king, when the temple of Atum in Tjeku is completed. On the third day of

[17] Vernus 1995.

[18] Original publication Naville 1902–1903; see also Andersson and Sjöberg 1904. For recent discussions, see Thiers 1997, Minas 1994, Lorton 1971, Goedicke 1989. Full translation in Roeder 1959, 108–128. The new edition and study by Thiers ('Les prêtres d'Atoum de Tjékou') came too late to be used in this chapter.

[19] Bingen 1943; Grzybek 1990, 69–112.

[20] Minas 1994, 205.

the third month of inundation, the king renders him to Tjeku, and the next morning, the building is completed, during a festival. The king also visits another place with a view to providing Atum with benefactions—in particular, a land grant seems to be intended.

Now we reach a passage which is in all probability connected with the first Syrian war.[21] It should, however, be critically remarked that we do not have a new date for this event indicated in the text, and that nothing is told of any battle—nor, indeed, are we told anything which would definitely force us to believe that Philadelphus ever left the area of the Ptolemaic possessions. It is stated that the king went to the regions of Asia—if the decipherment of the last word is correct.[22] A long discussion has taken place about this campaign of Philadelphus, whose specific aim is indicated in the hieroglyphic text as *prs*—and a group of two *t*-signs, a throw-stick, another *t* and the determinative of the foreign country. Some people have taken it to mean Palestine,[23] while others have even thought of Persia.[24] Personally, I think the equation with Palestine is highly dubious, to say the least.[25] The group of two *t*-signs and the determinative of the foreign country normally stand simply as a determinative without phonetic value, and besides, I see no convincing explanation of how the *n* could be omitted in the rendering at this time. Persia, even while geographically obviously wrong, would make sense insofar as the motive of deporting stelae from Egypt was connected with the Persian occupation.

In any case, the king found there images of the gods of Egypt, and he sent them back to Egypt where they were received with jubilation. There are some tricky details in the description of the voyage of those statues. If I understand it rightly, it says that the king was on board ship with them, and that they sailed from the canal/swamp of the east of Egypt till the harpoon nome (Pithom), and this is presented as something never before done in the land. The regaining of the statues is also connected with a royal decree issued on the tenth (?) day of the

---

[21] Winnicki 1990.

[22] This was at least confirmed by Winter (*apud* Winnicki 1990, 158), from a collation of the original.

[23] So Lorton 1971, 160–164; also Winnicki 1990, 161–163. Most recently Huss 2001, 267. So Thiers, 'Les prêtres d'Atoum de Tjékou', 40.

[24] So Sethe at *Urkunden* II, 91, and Roeder 1959, 119.

[25] It is normally based on an inscription of a royal messenger, last discussed by Schipper (1999, 193–196): the problematic question of dating (not all of Schipper's arguments are pertinent) impinges upon the problem of geographical interpretation.

fourth (?) month of winter, to the effect that priests from the temples of Egypt should come for them. This section is concluded in a way promising rule to the king and his son after him, which sounds as if he could conclude a composition.

The motive is well known for the early Ptolemaic period. In the inscriptions of Ptolemies I, II, III and IV reference is made to bringing back Egyptian cult images taken away by the Persians.[26] We also have this idea in a demotic literary text, the so-called *Prophecy of the Lamb*, and its reflections might even be seen in an unpublished tale about King Djoser looking in Nineveh for the body relics of Osiris.[27] I will not go into the factual veracity of those statements but it should be evident that they constitute innovations insofar as no Egyptian king of the pre-Assyrian time would have had much reason to look abroad for lost divine images.

A new section is introduced by a date, regnal year twelve, first month of inundation, day three. Then his majesty travels around Egypt, together with his queen Arsinoe, and they reach the harpoon nome. The couple thinks of protecting Egypt there against its neighbours. We could of course speculate whether this tour was in any way related to the royal marriage, even if that would mean setting it at about the latest possible date nowadays discussed by the specialists. In any case, the royal ideas seem to have taken some years to come to fruition, because only for regnal year sixteen is it narrated how the king actually has a canal excavated, leading from Heliopolis to the Lake of Scorpions, intended to drive off invaders. Here follow several lists of royal benefactions by the king for Atum. Mainly they concern victuals, but also clothes, and besides, a quarter of the caravan tax. Such lists are quite well known also from earlier periods.

Then the king sets out to found a new city, named after the daughter of King Ptolemy. What exactly her name was seems a bit doubtful, since it is not directly given in hieroglyphs. Sethe, in his edition, proposed Ptolemais, whereas Roeder assumes Arsinoe. Perhaps the best solution is that it was Berenike Hormos.[28] Then a fleet of high-sea ships is sent out to sail the Red Sea, and there, a city is founded, named after the king—so obviously to be identified as Ptolemais Theron. This is presented as something never before done, and it is clearly stated that

[26] Winnicki 1994.
[27] Quack 2005, 27 and 153.
[28] Huss 2001, 289 n. 284.

the goal was to capture elephants—which, again, is unprecedented. Furthermore, the sacred bulls, Apis, Mnevis and the speckled bull were distinguished: probably their stables were built anew.[29] In any case, king and queen were present, and this is recorded as not having been done before by any king of Egypt. Further benefactions of the king for the temples in general, and specifically in the one of Per-Kerehet, are enumerated. There are quite considerable amounts of precious metal, especially silver, but unfortunately without indication of the basis for the count. Perhaps staters were intended, since the word 'silver' is directly followed by a number. It is told that they were engraved on a stela in the dromos of the temple of Tjeku when he appeared as a king and inaugurated the temple, and there was a festival in the city. The stela concludes with the usual blessings for the king, the force of his rule and the submission of foreign countries.

In general, the Pithom stela has a visible stress on the new achievements never before accomplished by any king. Still, in its form and structure it stays quite close to earlier models, perhaps more so than the Mendes stela. What are new are the actual achievements—and that is the act of positive surpassing which was always considered appropriate in Egypt.

In recent times, a fairly fragmentary monument has been able to be reconstructed to some degree, thanks mainly to the efforts of Christophe Thiers.[30] It was originally inscribed for the Delta city of Sais, but later transported to Rome, where it was placed in the Gardens of Sallust. Today, some of its fragments are still preserved in the Museum of Naples and in the Louvre, but for other parts we are dependent on a renaissance sketch made without knowledge of hieroglyphs. The sketch was, however, done so carefully that most is safely legible nowadays. And yet the lack of the original seems highly important to me, in view of one specific question: Is the text quite complete as it stands? Is the last preserved line really the last one of the text? Thiers seems to suppose without further discussion that it is, but I disagree. One factor speaks in favour of completeness, namely the somewhat larger spacing of the column-divider after the last preserved line. There are, however, two other indications militating against such a solution. The offering-scene in the top part has only

[29] Roeder assumes in his translation that they visited one another, but that should be *rḏi.n=f sḫn=sn*, not *ỉri.n=f sḫn=sn*.

[30] Thiers 1999 and 2001.

some feet of the participants preserved in the renaissance drawings, but the composition seems highly unbalanced as it stands now. We have two persons on each side: behind those to the right (who are more probably the ruling couple, offering something), there is quite a bit of space; those to the left (probably divinities) appear squeezed against the end, with no space left. In principle, the lower part of a sceptre visible between the two couples should mark the very centre of the original stela. Calculating like that, we should conclude that four additional columns of hieroglyphs come after the last preserved one.

While being less conclusive as to the absolute amount missing, another indication points in the same direction. While most of the text is in vertical columns, there is one horizontal line on the top containing the royal protocol. This cannot be complete as it stands. It gives the throne-name of Ptolemy II, Userkarê beloved of Amun. Behind that, we would expect his personal name Ptolemy rendered in hieroglyphs, and after that most likely a blessing formula such as 'given life in eternity', perhaps even with the addition of 'beloved of Neith' (or some other god or goddess). So this shows again that we have to reckon with more text written on the stela.

This does not immediately help us with understanding, because that text is irremediably lost, but it helps to get a more balanced view of the composition of the text. Among the preserved parts, the first six and a half lines of the text are simply an elaborate eulogy of the king, derived from traditional stock phrases. It is only with the second part of the seventh line that actual narration of facts and actions is initiated. In the reconstruction given by Thiers, that would make the second part definitely the shorter one, with only four and a half lines; and it would end in quite an awkward way, with the description of a royal appearance at the end of the last preserved column. My new proposal for the overall restitution would not only make the factual narrative longer than the eulogy—now with probably eight and a half lines—but also provide space for a more fitting end, with some decision taken and put in place by royal edict.

Now, what is preserved in the text? The first date given at the very beginning is year twenty-two of Ptolemy II, and then we have the eulogy describing his valour in battle as well as his actions for Neith and the gods of Sais. The second part begins with another date, this time regnal year twenty, and the king is speaking to his courtiers. He orders them to assemble all the provincial governors of Upper and Lower Egypt. When the text resumes after a lacuna, he declares his

intention to let a statue of Isis-Arsinoe appear, and to embellish the city. The courtiers concur. Afterwards, we have a new date in regnal year twenty-one. The king arrives at Sais and is greeted by the prophets and god's fathers of the temple. They wish to show the place of the gods to the king. Now we have a new date, but this time without a new indication of a year, only giving the fourth month of the season of spring, and then the day-date is lost. A great number of chariots and cavalry are supposed to follow the king, who appears and proceeds to the temple—and then the text breaks off. We can suppose that the priests granted the wish of the king to put up a statue of his dead queen and to give her divine honours, and especially to include her in the offering-cult. As a reward, Philadelphus would stick to his promise and embellish Sais with new cult-buildings, and probably also establish a material basis for the cult in the form of land-grants or tax-exemption.

Now for some general remarks. Philadelphus was certainly not the first actually to appropriate the form of hieroglyphic stelae for promoting his achievements. Already before him, we have the so-called Satrap stela (*Urkunden* II, 11–22) dating from before Ptolemy I officially took the title of king. That is quite similar to the inscriptions discussed here, and most specifically in one remarkable point which I would like to stress: all these texts have a tendency to be episodic, that is, they tell about a lot of different events, often years apart, and sometimes with a very loose internal coherence. Although not unheard-of, this is not the most usual way earlier pharaonic stelae were organised. Most of them focused on one of only few historical events or they gave overviews of building programmes in one area. Perhaps it is noticeable that there are some Egyptian texts which came rather close to the Ptolemaic stelae by also narrating long chains of events, often intermixed with narrations of spoils and donations. But the best cases, like the annals of Thutmosis III[31] or the chronicle of Prince Osorkon,[32] are not stelae: they are long texts written on temple walls. We should ask ourselves whether the Ptolemies were influenced by such models or if they had any other reasons for proceeding as they did. Here it would be interesting to hear the opinion of a specialist in Greek history, comparing how historical facts are presented in inscriptions in the Greek context. At least there are

[31] New study and edition, Redford 2003.
[32] Caminos 1958.

some Late Period royal inscriptions which record events over a number of years, although mostly with a clear thematic focus.[33] There are, for example, stelae of Taharqa (twenty-fifth dynasty) enumerating his donations to the temple from years two to eight[34] and years eight to ten.[35] Besides, the genre of inscriptions summing up different and not closely related events was alive in the Meroitic region, e.g. in the inscription (on the temple wall, not on a stela) of Anlamani at Kawa,[36] the fragmentary stelae of Ary,[37] or the long stelae of Harsiotef and Nastasen.[38] Perhaps those examples indicate that it might be a general trend of the later first millennium to change the scope of royal inscriptions; in any case, the Philadelphus inscriptions owe more to recent development than to old traditions in this respect.

In the Mendes stela, the Egyptian worship of animals figures quite prominently, and in the Pithom stela, it is mentioned as well. The tradition of the Ptolemies to style themselves as protectors and patrons of sacred animals is amazingly rich. Also in the decrees of Canopus and Memphis, care for them, especially Apis and Mnevis, comes into play. Even the Raphia decree, although mainly concerned with bellicose activities, does not neglect to mention that Ptolemy IV looked after the sacred animals in the Asiatic provinces which had been maltreated by the Seleucid troops. The stress on such actions definitely surpasses what is known for the indigenous pharaohs. For examples, in the great Papyrus Harris, where he recounts all the important deeds of his reign, Ramesses III speaks quite briefly about the cows of the Apis and Mnevis bulls, without even enumerating anything he did for the bulls themselves.

Two different kinds of explanation offer themselves. One would be that, as foreign invaders, the Ptolemies had a greater need to get connected with Egyptian religion in order to make their rule acceptable. The second would be that we are facing a global trend towards greater veneration of animals, which took place perhaps around 700 BC when large-scale necropoleis of animals begin to appear. For the pre-Ptolemaic rulers of the first millennium BC, we have only a fairly limited record of preserved inscriptions, and it is possible that it was really

[33] See also Gozzoli, 2003, who is not concerned with the points I am analysing here.
[34] Macadam 1948, 4–14 and plates 5–6.
[35] Macadam 1948, 32–41 and plates 11–12.
[36] Macadam 1948, 50–67 and plates 17–26.
[37] Macadam 1948, 76–81 and plates 32–34.
[38] Both republished and studied in Peust 1999; see also Quack 2002.

then when the behavioural models were set which the Greek dynasty followed.

Now it is time to speak of a specific Ptolemaic institution, namely the priestly synods and their decrees.[39] Huss has tried to establish the meetings of priests at Sais (266/5?) and Mendes (between 264/3 and 259) as the earliest attested cases. He considers the inscriptions of the Mendes stela and the Sais text as examples of such decrees. I see difficulties in following such reasoning because the formal structuring of those two inscriptions is utterly different from the later, more assured synodal decrees. Nowhere is the text stylised as a decision taken by the priests.[40] It is always the king who acts, and the most the priests do is to agree with him. Still, in the Sais inscription the king really orders the governors and prophets of the temples of Upper and Lower Egypt to come to his court, and this can be considered as a forerunner of the true synod—the development would be to grant more power of decision, at least nominally, to the priests, who can take the initiative and propose measures to honour the king and his family on their own.

In terms of the development of the relations between the Egyptians and their Macedonian king, this should be considered as a fairly decisive factor, in the long term, and it means a serious change from all earlier models. Before, the standard situation is what Egyptologists frequently call the 'king's novel'.[41] I do not intend to discuss whether this is justified as a term of literary analysis, but the way political decision-making is presented to the public should be evident. The pharaoh proposes some action. Either his courtiers acclaim this immediately, or in the rare cases where they have some doubts, the pharaoh overcomes them and is always justified by the outcome. Philadelphus still follows that ancient model in his historical inscriptions—he takes the lead, and the priests and courtiers agree. With the inauguration of the genre of the synodal decree, a far-reaching change in the official presentation of decision-making is reached. It might be possible to read it in two diametrically opposite ways. On the one hand, it might be interpreted as granting more power to the indigenous element against the foreign rulers; and normally scholars see the internal development of those decrees as showing growing Egyptian influence in content, although

[39] See for them Huss 1991, Kügler 1994 and Pfeiffer 2004, 9–12.
[40] Pfeiffer (2004, 9) expresses doubts whether they can be taken as a real synod.
[41] For this, see most recently Hofmann 2004.

this can be somewhat doubted.[42] On the other hand, as an Egyptologist I cannot totally overcome the impression that the new stylisation of decisions might be due to the prevailing Hellenic model of popular assemblies voting for public honours being given to some person.[43] Normally, people see no pharaonic antecedents for such assemblies of priests in one place to take decisions. I might propose at least some hints, although they contain more problems than solutions.[44]

First, I know of an unpublished text preserved in at least three hieratic papyri, all dating to the Roman period. They purport to be copies of royal decrees or early rulers. Neferkasokar, Djoser and Kheops are explicitly named in the preserved parts. The main topic is a complete renovation and restoration of the cult buildings, and one section (of which fairly extensive remnants are preserved) seems to be an official order to the specific priests and priestesses of all individual nomes of Egypt to come to the residence. The formulations have some similarity to the way the Sais inscription runs. Unfortunately, I have no way of ascertaining the real date of these royal decrees, so that proposing them as the forerunners of these synods is not without difficulties—they might also be totally pseudepigraphic compositions modelled after an already existing system. Perhaps future research will bring more clarity in this matter. Another passage, also preserved in papyri of the Roman period, concerns related problems. In this case, I am speaking of the equally unpublished *Book of the Temple*, whose edition I am currently preparing. Of specific interest for us is a passage in the instruction for the governor and overseer of the prophets. Unfortunately, it is quite fragmentary, but I would like to present a translation in its entirety. Of the governors and overseer of the prophets, it is told:

> It is they who receive the decrees of the king which come from the residence, and who hear the words which come about them, in order to command […repo]rt thereof to the majesty of the palace […] proceed to the residence together with […] thrice a year, the senior governor at the new year's festival and the feast of […] sed-festival together with […]

The many lacunae in the text make any precise interpretation difficult, but it seems at least likely that the highest ranks should assemble at the royal palace from time to time when it came to important

[42] Pfeiffer 2004, 11.
[43] Kügler (1994, 56–58) already goes in this direction.
[44] See the brief presentation of both of them in Quack 2000.

political decision, or also routinely from time to time. Again, I have only Roman-period manuscripts, and cannot yet give a definite answer for questions of dating the archetype; but at least it must be older than the decree of Canopus (238 BC), because the text always operates with a system of four phylae—and one of the most important measures of the decree of Canopus was to create a fifth phyle. So I cannot simply say that I have evidence for an earlier tradition of priestly assemblies, but at least there seems some probability for it.

THE PROBLEM OF THE PTOLEMAIC SIBLING MARRIAGE: A CASE OF DYNASTIC ACCULTURATION?

Kostas Buraselis

One of the salient features and the never finally resolved (or resolvable) problems of Ptolemaic history is sibling marriage. It all started ca. 278 BC with the return of Arsinoe II to Egypt,[1] after an adventurous queenship first beside Lysimachos of Thrace and then Ptolemy Ceraunus, her half-brother, in Macedonia. Ptolemy II then married his full sister and subsequently acquired the official by-name Philadelphos ('brother-loving').[2] The ancient tradition that refers to that act is limited. The only contemporary literary evidence for the new royal marriage is an eulogy by the court poet Theocritus and a metaphorical invective by Sotades. Theocritus refers to it in sublime verses of his Encomium to Ptolemy.[3] He emphasizes the unique love of Arsinoe II for her brother and husband (κατασίγνητόν τε πόσιν τε) and skilfully compares the pair's relation to the sacred marriage (ἱερὸς γάμος) of the established divine sibling royalty on Olympus (βασιλῆας Ὀλύμπου), Zeus and Hera, the common bed of whom Iris prepared with myrrhed hands.[4] On the other hand, Sotades was executed in an exemplary way

[1] On the probable temporal context of Arsinoe II's return to Egypt and marriage with Ptolemy II (between 279 and 274) cf. recently Huß 2001:307 n. 22, who offers a useful summary of the relevant problems and views.

[2] Criscuolo 1990 was right in emphasizing the wider use of this epithet, that is not restricted to sibling marriages and eventually denoting more generally the fact of excellent relations between royal children of the same parent(s), inside the Ptolemaic dynasty and the rest Hellenistic world. However, its first dynastic application in the case of Arsinoe II cannot be separated from the exact character of her relation to her brother and the need to exalt the fact of their marriage (cf. Fraser 1972: I.217). A similar relation was certainly implied in all further cases of royal brothers and sisters called together *philadelphoi*: Criscuolo's effort (94 with n. 24) e.g. to disprove such a content in the use of the epithet for Mithridates IV and Laodice of Pontus simply cannot convince.

[3] Theoc., *Id.* 17. 128ff. Theocritus' case cannot have been isolated, of course: cf. n. 7 below. Callimachus also wrote an *epithalamion* for that royal sibling wedding (frg. 392 Pfeiffer), and it seems quite probable that he used a similar imagery to conciliate Greek opinion with offending court developments.

[4] It is noteworthy that Theocritus wisely places the mention of the sibling marriage

for accusing the king εἰς οὐχ ὁσίην τρυμαλιὴν τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς, "you are pushing the prong into an unholy fleshpot" (Green 1990:82). The latter incident and Sotades' verse are known from both Plutarch (*Mor.* 11a) and Athenaeus (620f.), while Plutarch further comments on the endogamous marriage of the king in another passage[5] describing it as something held to be "strange and unlawful" (ἀλλόκοτον… καὶ ἄθεσμον).[6] Sotades' suicidal comment and Plutarch's remark unmistakably show that the Greek public opinion in both Philadelphos' and later ages distanced itself from the new royal habit of the Ptolemies, to the effect that divine parallels had to be dexterously mobilised by Theocritus.[7]

However, was this sort of marriage a complete Ptolemaic novelty or did it have to do with atypical Greek or Egyptian traditions? In the Greek world, we know that marriage between half-siblings was well-known and sometimes lawful, although at least in Athens (where we have some evidence to work with) it was rather rare and somehow morally unpalatable.[8] Thus Cimon's half-sister (from the same father but from a different mother) Elpinice was probably for a period formally accepted but also socially disputed as his wife in Athens,[9] while in the first royal house of Macedonia, the Argeads, Ptolemy of Alorus, a son of Amyntas III, seems to have married a half-sister from the same father, Eurynoe (Ogden 1999:14–16, 78). While such rare cases do appear, one should emphasize that a marriage between full siblings simply cannot be attested among ancient Greek customs, while the reprimanding testimonies of Euripides (*Andromache*, 173ff.) and Plato (*Laws*, 838a–c) sufficiently show that such unions were morally rejected.

---

just before the conclusion of the poem, in a sort of consummation of Ptolemy II's divine identity.

[5] Mor. 736f. On these Greek reactions to the marriage cf. Modrzejewski 1998.

[6] 'Unlawful' in the grave sense of 'violating socially accepted rules' as is best shown by Plutarch's, *Caes.* 10 own use of the same adjective to describe P. Clodius' sacrilegious intrusion into the Bona Dea festival of 62BC but also with the undertone of 'immoral, criminal' as e.g. in the Old Testament, 3 *Maccabees* 5. 12 where Philopator's plan of having the Jews trampled by his elephants receives the same characterization.

[7] Cf. also the case of the otherwise unknown rhapsode flattering Ptolemy II (on the day of his wedding with his sister) with a similarly adroit citation of Homer in Plut. (n. 5). Cf. Hazzard 2000:89.

[8] Cf. esp. Karabélias 1991; Modrzejewski 1993:59–60 and 1999:270–273; Vérilhac & Vial 1998:91–101 (esp. 94).

[9] Half-sister: Nep., *Cim.* 1.2. Social reactions/"illegality" of the relationship: Plut., *Cim.* 4.6, 8; 15.4. Athen. 589 e.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that there is ample ancient literary evidence connecting the custom of full sibling marriage specifically with Egypt and its local traditions. Pausanias (I. 7. 1) wrote that Ptolemy II Ἀρσινόης ἀδελφῆς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐρασθεὶς ἔγημεν αὐτήν, Μακεδόσιν οὐδαμῶς ποιῶν νομιζόμενα, Αἰγυπτίοις μέντοι ὧν ἦρχε, "fell in love with his full sister Arsinoe, not behaving in accordance with Macedonian custom but with that of his Egyptian subjects". Without connecting this 'Egyptian custom' with Ptolemy's marriage, other authors also ascribed such a practice to an Egyptian tradition. The earliest[10] evidence of this sort appears in Diodorus (I. 27, 1–2) who states that sibling marriage (γαμεῖν ἀδελφάς) was an Egyptian custom, differing from the practice followed in the rest of the world, and traces it back to the example of Isis (Ἴσιδος ἐπίτευγμα). The Egyptian goddess, says Diodorus, had set that example through her devotion to the memory of Osiris, her valiant revenge of his death and her lawful and for all people beneficent royalty (βασιλεύουσαν νομιμώτατα, καὶ τὸ σύνολον πλείστων καὶ μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν αἰτίαν γενέσθαι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις). Our source goes then on to explain against this background its view of a superior position of woman versus man in the royal and private Egyptian setting.

In later, imperial contexts, Memnon of Heraclea (*FGrHist* 434 F 8, 7), Philo of Alexandria (*Spec. Laws*, III. 23–25 = Loeb Philo, VII, pp. 486ff.), Seneca (*Apocol.* 8. 3) and Sextus Empiricus (*Pyr.* I. 152, III. 205, 234) also refer to sibling marriage as part of Egyptian tradition. Memnon speaks of such an "ancestral Egyptian" custom (πάτριον τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις) commenting on the marriage of Ptolemy Ceraunus to Arsinoe II, that is a marriage between half-siblings, while Sextus Empiricus attributes to the Egyptians sibling marriage in general, that is not specifying whether full or not. Philo and Seneca are more specific in regarding the 'extreme' form of sibling marriage, that is between full siblings, as a part of Egyptian tradition, connecting the half forms of the same practice with Athens or Sparta (in Philo, not verified by other sources: Vérilhac and Vial 1998:94). Philo is the most categorical in his moral rejection of this custom as a sort of unnatural vice.[11]

[10] The date of Diodorus' testimony (around 30 BC) increases its value especially because it predates the development of Egypt in the Roman Empire when such sibling marriages actually became characteristic of Egyptian society. Apparently, the few known certain (cf. n. 41 below) instances of such private unions during the Ptolemaic period correspond to a more widespread contemporaneous view of the existence of the sibling-marriage-custom in Egypt.

[11] To demonstrate this best he uses the extreme example of twins, separated by

Interpreting the sibling marriage of the Ptolemies as Pausanias interpreted it, that is, as the adoption of a long-standing Egyptian custom, would need to be verified by earlier Egyptian evidence. In actual fact, documentary evidence from Egypt presents a more differentiated picture. While the custom of sibling marriage (also in its full form) is well attested in Roman Egypt,[12] Jaroslav Černý (1954:29) detected only two practically certain private Egyptian cases during the long Pharaonic period, leaving it uncertain whether the same marriages were between full siblings or not. Later research has even called the sibling character of these two unions into question.[13] Full sibling marriages within the Pharaonic families are not numerous and they are now sometimes disputed, especially the full-sibling cases.[14]

Confronted with this evidence, modern scholarship has tried to explain Ptolemaic sibling marriage in ways different from the way in which Pausanias understood it. Two main interpretative lines seem to have prevailed. Joseph Mélèze-Modrzejewski has repeatedly expressed the view that the Ptolemaic habit was essentially of Greek origin, the Lagids having pushed to its extreme limit "une tendance véhiculée par les traditions grecques en ce qui concerne l'endogamie des proches parents collatéraux".[15] His view coincides partly with that of Brent Shaw, who treats Egyptian sibling marriage in a long perspective and from an anthropological viewpoint,[16] and traces back the boom of sibling marriages in Ptolemaic *and* Roman Egypt to the feeling of racial prejudice and intentional seclusion of the Greek and Hellenized elements of the population of Egypt, in a sort of ancient *apartheid*

---

nature but reunited against their wish in the case of such a marriage (23), while he also comments on the unreasonable neglect of actually limitless possibilities for social expansion by families practising it (25). The background is, of course, the full justification and praise of Mosaic Law.

[12] The main bibliography includes: Hombert and Préaux 1949; Thierfelder 1960; Middleton 1962; Hopkins 1980; Shaw 1992; Modrzejewski 1993^2; Bagnall & Frier 1994:127–134.

[13] Robins 1979: esp. 202 f. on the terms *sn* and *snt*. Cf. also Meskell 2002:98 f.

[14] Examples of scepsis concerning such a Pharaonic practice: Bowman 1986:24; Hölbl 1994:106; Shaw 2000:228/9 (B.M. Bryan) and 408 (A.B. Lloyd). However, one may contrast with these views Robins 1993:69; Shaw and Nicholson 1995:171; Ziegler 2002:254: Schmitt 2005:373, where the existence of the phenomenon in the history of the Pharaohs is unreservedly affirmed.

[15] Modrzejewski 1999:270–273; 1993^2; 1998:573–576.

[16] Shaw 1992:283: "…the family of the Ptolemies took the Greek tendency to endogamy to its logical limits".

spirit.[17] A variant of this Hellenocentric interpretation is supported by Hazzard (2000:85–93, esp. 89) who considers that Philadelphos was simply seeking to present himself and his sister-queen as close to the ruling divine couple of the Greek pantheon, Zeus and Hera, as possible.

Another approach was initiated by Elizabeth Carney (1987) in a penetrating study under the characteristic title *The Reappearance of Royal Sibling Marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt*. She is disinclined to connect the 'reappearance' of sibling marriage among the Lagids with Pharaonic precedents on the grounds that the disadvantage of the foreseeable Greek opposition to the new royal marriage practice was not negligible, while the general policy of the early Ptolemies would not betray any tendency of the dynasty to please primarily its Egyptian subjects or deviate from a basically Hellenocentric concept of kingship (Carney 1987:431–432). Moreover, the Pharaonic examples of such marriages were sporadic and never assumed the significance of "a fundamental element in Pharaonic kingship" (Carney 1987:433), so that its adoption by the Ptolemies would have given sufficient sense. Instead, she prefers to see this peculiar Ptolemaic marriage practice as "an isolationist custom", stemming from a similar geopolitical context as that of Pharaonic times and intending "to consolidate a dynasty, by significantly reducing potential rivals for the throne descended through the female line" (Carney 1987:434). On the other hand, in a perhaps unconscious self-contradiction, she is ready to admit that in later phases the frequency of sibling marriage in the Ptolemaic dynasty was also due to "the growing Egyptianization of Ptolemaic rule" (Carney 1987:436). Her views have been positively evaluated by further students of the subject. Daniel Ogden, (1999:77–78) also seriously but concisely considered the Pharaonic connection, and Peter Fraser (1972: I.117, II.209) was inclined to accept that the basic origin of Ptolemaic sibling marriage was Pharaonic. The late Keith Hopkins wrote, "I feel sure that Pausanias was right, although some modern scholars have disputed it. The Greek kings of Egypt were following Egyptian custom".[18] Eric Turner (1984:136–138) carefully adhered to the indigenous interpretation of the Ptolemaic custom. What follows is a modest attempt to elaborate on the same line of thought. The effort is even more worth making, I

[17] Shaw 1992:286, adopting a relevant formulation of N. Lewis.

[18] Hopkins 1980:312. The same view had been also expressed in a short form among older literature especially by Macurdy 1932:118; Hombert and Préaux 1949:137; Green 1990:404.

think, after Ager's ambitious study of the whole practice of incest by the Ptolemies. Here the initiation of the phenomenon and the Egyptian policy of the dynasty are on the whole accorded a relatively secondary role, while more importance is ascribed to symbolic aspects of dynastic behaviour, luxury and power towards an interpretation of this marital policy in a richly variegated spectrum of conscious and subconscious motives.[19]

First of all, it would be useful to achieve clarity on Pharaonic precedents, especially as their inclusion of full sibling cases has been questioned (see above). Two examples of the latter sort seem beyond doubt. The oldest I could spot is Pharaoh Mentuhotep II of the eleventh Dynasty who, around 2000 BC, married his full sister Nefuru III.[20] Two hundred years later, Amenemhet IV (twelfth dynasty) married his sister Nefrousobek who succeeded him on the throne.[21] Again approximately two hundred years later (ca. 1600 BC), Seqenenre Tao II (seventeenth dynasty) has his full sister Ahhotep I as consort.[22] In the following years Pharaoh Ahmose and his sister-queen Ahmose Nofretere should be the children of the previously mentioned sibling Pharaonic marriage.[23] Also Amenophis I (Amenhotep) seems to have married Ahhotep II his own full sister.[24] Amenophis II first married his sister Meretamun.[25] The famous Hatchepsout was married to her half-brother Thutmosis II (Grimal 1988:250). In about 1000 BC Pharaoh Psusennes I (twenty-first dynasty) married his sister Mutnodjmet.[26] Not all these cases were necessarily marriages between full siblings, but together they constitute a set of Pharaonic precedents. Moreover, if Queen Amessis who

[19] Ager 2005:17, where it seems difficult to accept her view that the "Egyptian angle" cannot provide a full answer because "in a sense, it only begs the question: after all, why should the *Pharaohs* have practised incestuous marriage (even to the limited extent that they did)?" We cannot seek an answer to all historical questions at once. If the Pharaohs built a precedent (as she also suggests), then they could be used and projected as a model by the Ptolemies irrespective of the initial Pharaonic reasons for initiating that practice, which did not need to be identical with the Ptolemaic ones. On the whole, I regard her attempt at an interpretation of Ptolemaic incest as thought-provoking but unconvincing.

[20] W.C.Hayes, in: *CAH*[3], I.2, 478, 481.

[21] J. v. Beckerath, *LdÄ*, I. 192, s.v. Amenemhet IV.

[22] W. Seipel, *LdÄ*, I. 98, s.v. Ahhotep I.

[23] M. Gitton, *LdÄ*, I. 102, s.v. Ahmose Nofretere (A).

[24] W. Seipel, *LdÄ*, I. 99, s.v. Ahhotep II.

[25] J. v. Beckerath, *LdÄ*, IV. 89, s.v. Meretamun (3).

[26] A. Kitchen, *LdÄ*, IV. 1176, s.v. Psusennes I.

appears in Manetho[27] to have succeeded her brother has been correctly identified—on the basis of the duration of rule—with Hatchepsout, sibling marriages in Pharaonic times must have been signalised, quite naturally, in a work written down under and probably for Ptolemy II himself.[28] Thus even the sparse known cases of sibling, even full sibling, marriages of the Pharaonic dynasties cannot be reasonably be thought to have vanished so easily from later memory or have represented in Ptolemaic times unimportant details of the long past of Egypt. Despite their rarity against the usual Pharaonic marriage practice, they certainly built up a respectable and indigenous royal precedent.[29]

Far more significant is the divine-royal precedent. Brother-sister marriage inside the pantheon of the country certainly constituted a basic trait of Egyptian religious beliefs. Isis and Osiris, Nephthys and Seth were sibling pairs and symbols of the perfect love and union inside the divine family in its founding stage.[30] As Gay Robins has aptly remarked in a study of the Pharaonic queens of the eighteenth dynasty, this sort of marriage naturally matched a creation myth, where the first gods must resort to such expedients, and at the same time inspired a similar act by the Pharaonic king who thus "removed himself from his subjects and approached the divine circle".[31] By removing himself ideally from his subjects, the king only held them more tightly in the bonds of faith and loyalty to the state and to the divinely ruled universe.

One should also recall that Isis and Osiris were not only gods but also members of the first recognized Pharaonic Dynasty of Egyptian tradition, as it officially appeared in Manetho's work. In Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* we find precisely as the fifth reign of this Dynasty, following that of Cronus: Ὄσιρις καὶ Ἶσις, ἔτη λε (35 years).[32] The divine sibling couple and its joint government in exemplary love to each other had a formal, dated place in the sequence of Pharaonic reigns as systematized

---

[27] Frg. 50 Waddell (Loeb), with the editor's comment.

[28] Manetho, frg. 3 Waddell (Loeb), p. 14.

[29] Dynastic marriage between half siblings appeared also in the Achaemenids of Persia and the Hecatomnids of Caria, but full sibling marriage is certainly attested only among the former, where it seems to have taken the place of a spectacular exception: the case of Cambyses having married two full sisters according to Hdt. 3.31. Cf. Briant 1996:105 and Ogden 1999:125–127 with further discussion.

[30] Cf. S. Allam, *LdÄ*, II, s.v. Geschwisterehe (569).

[31] Robins 1993:70. Ziegler 2002:254: "These unions reenacted the creation of the world…"

[32] Frg. 3 Waddell (Loeb), from Syncellus.

by Manetho. The *exemplum divinum* was also conceived in Philadelphos' time as an archetypal concrete *exemplum regium*, no doubt sanctioning later such Pharaonic cases but also surpassing by far their value as a basic model for the Ptolemies.

It is well-known how systematic the connection or the identification of the cult of Isis and Arsinoe II was (cf. Hölbl 1994:95; Huß 2001:309). Two examples might suffice in this context. In the famous Vatican statue of Egyptian provenance (Heliopolis?) the deified Arsinoe II is expressly called "daughter of Geb" and "image of Isis" (Quaegebeur 1988:49; 1998:86 no. 5). Perhaps more pertinent in respect to her combination with brother-loving goddesses of the Egyptian pantheon is her representation on the reliefs of the Philadelphos Portal at Philae where the king is sacrificing once before Isis and Arsinoe and once before Nephthys and Arsinoe (Hölbl 1994:95; Quaegebeur 1998:93 no. 37). The specific appropriateness in the company of the deified queen and her divine brother-loving parallels should not escape notice.

It is probably not a coincidence that the royal sibling marriages of the eighteenth dynasty noted above are contemporaneous to the introduction of the use of the terms 'brother' and 'sister' for the mutual address of beloved or married persons even without a sibling connection (Černý 1954:25; Robins 1979:203). The metaphorical use of the words in most of these cases seems established but, psychologically, this practice meant that the quality of endearment natural in marriage or similar relations could be ideally expressed in terms of love between brother and sister. We have no similar phenomenon in ancient Greek and many other societies. Therefore we may here grasp a part of genuine ancient Egyptian mentality, probably inspired by the divine models of sibling love that were not followed (and did not need to be followed) by common people but at the same time did not fail to shape powerful, venerated ideals. To realize an ideal would not be primarily the cause of mortals but of immortals in the heaven or on the throne. However, the cultural climate among the indigenous population for the earthly appearance of such a phenomenon must have been under these conditions all but unfavourable.

Furthermore, the importance of the introduction of the Ptolemaic dynastic cult of *living* kings has not been sufficiently recognized. Ptolemy II had taken care of founding a cult of his dead parents, the Theoi Soteres, after the beginning of his sole rule. Nevertheless, that act was something very different from the next step he took by creating the cult of his sister and consort Arsinoe, already bearing the title

Philadelphos, and himself as Theoi Adelphoi.[33] Unfortunately, there is still no general agreement on the date of this religious innovation. I am inclined to accept Koenen's date of Philadelphos' fourteenth year in P.Hib. 2. 199, where we first find the joint cult of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi, in 272/1 BC, counting back Philadelphos' regnal years not from his sole rule (282) but from his coregency with his father three years earlier (285). This means that both sibling consorts were alive and reigning when they first appeared as gods by the side of Alexander in the Greek edition of the official Ptolemaic dynastic cult. We move here in the extremely disputed terrain of early Ptolemaic chronology where Grzybek's detailed observations have brought some new light but also further dissent. Widely disputed is his dating of Arsinoe II's death to 268 instead of the traditional 270.[34] However, even if we assume that Arsinoe II was deified and the cult of her and her brother was instituted and added to that of Alexander after the queen's death, it is indisputable that this would mean again the religious elevation of at least the still reigning Ptolemy II to the status of *living* god.[35] In this context, the acceptance of the rulers as incarnations of traditional Egyptian gods or the identification with them (as in the case of Arsinoe and Isis) must have been highly instrumental.

This was no minor change on the level of official dynastic cult in the Ptolemaic kingdom. Simultaneously, it was a decisive progress towards the firm ideological establishment of Ptolemaic kingship both in the eyes of Greeks and Egyptians. Especially concerning the latter, Arsinoe II was the first Ptolemaic queen with a really extensive native cult and figural representations on many art monuments,[36] appearing already during her life and really thriving after her death as we shall see. In the framework of the native dynastic cult of the Ptolemies, the first link of the chain of deified rulers was the cult of the Theoi Adelphoi (Koenen 1993:54). It was obviously at this stage that the Ptolemaic dynastic cult achieved its appropriate and regular enshrinement

[33] On the cult of the Soteres and the Theoi Adelphoi see esp. Koenen 1993:51f.; Huß 2001:325.

[34] See Hölbl 1994:38,288 n. 29; D.J. Thompson, *OCD*[3] (1996), s.v. Arsinoe II, 177; Huß 2001:310 n. 41; Ager 2003:40.

[35] Cf. already the remarks in the same spirit by Quaegebeur 1988:47f.; Huß 2001: 325.

[36] See Quaegebeur 1978:260f.; 1998 listing the relevant evidence; Hölbl 1994:94–98. On the importance of the Pharaonic queen-title and headdress of Arsinoe II: Hauben 1983:108–110.

in the indigenous world of Egypt. On a base once bearing the statues of Amun, Arsinoe and Ptolemy II at Alexandria (Museum of the Serapeum), the god addresses the deified queen with the prophetic phrase: "I will make you a goddess *at the head of the gods on earth*…" (Quaegebeur 1988:43).

We should not forget here the context of political history. The Ptolemaic kingdom had survived without serious loss the First Syrian War (274–271) with its eternal rivals, the Seleucids, over the possession of Koile Syria. However, a serious problem for Ptolemy II remained in the continuing direct neighbourhood of Magas' separatist royal rule over the Cyrenaica. The defence of Egypt against Magas ca. 274 had exposed Philadelphos' rule to serious danger averted in the last moment, not far from Alexandria itself, because of internal problems of the ruler of Cyrene with his own African subjects.[37] Thus the Ptolemaic power lavishly celebrated and exhibited in the famous Alexandrian procession (*pompe*), which also belongs to the seventies (probably 279/8 or 275/4),[38] had serious reasons to forge solid bonds and links inside Egypt to view the future with confidence. With Magas on his western flank, an internal front would have been fatal for Philadelphos.

This was a critical age of internal crystallization and consolidation for the Hellenistic kingdoms. The Ptolemies' great rivals, the Antigonids of Macedonia, went through a difficult re-adjustment to the natural capacities and traditions of their dominion under Gonatas, the success of which then assured his dynasty's stable position up to the confrontation with Rome. Bengtson once entitled the period from the aftermath of Curupedium to Rome's military intervention in the East as that of a "balance between the (great) powers" (*Gleichgewicht der Kräfte*) in the Hellenistic world.[39] If present at all, this balance presupposed the effort of each separate kingdom to attain a sufficient balance among the major players of its interior game.

The sibling marriage of Ptolemy II and the cult of Arsinoe II did prove their expert reasoning in regard to the feelings of the Egyptians especially through the widespread acceptance and abiding popularity of the cult of the dead queen. Of course, her loving brother promoted the veneration of his sister inside traditional Egyptian religion through

---

[37] Paus. I.7.2; Polyaen. II.28; Huß 2001:268.

[38] Cf. Fraser 1972: I.231; Huß 2001:321–323.

[39] Bengtson 1969:399. The precariousness of that situation has been now aptly assessed in the title of Ager 2003 as "uneasy balance".

establishing her as *synnaos thea* of all Egyptian gods (Mendes stele) (Quaegebeur 1978:249; 1998:87; Hölbl 1994:94). His decision to devote a certain part of the tax on orchards and vineyards (the *apomoira*) to the sustentation of that cult assisted its duration (Koenen 1993:66–69; Hölbl 1994:97,304 n. 164). However, all this would not have been effective unless real popularity of the queen in Egyptian eyes allowed it to be. That the Egyptian cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos is attested in more than twenty five different places is indicative enough (Huß 1994:98, n. 115). Also indicative is the further success, almost regularity, of such sibling connections in the sequel of Ptolemaic history, notably reflected in Egyptian cult. Thus in the case of the Theoi Philopatores, the couple of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III, it is perhaps characteristic that the addition of their names to the Egyptian edition of the dynastic cult predates now that in the Greek one (Koenen 1993:54). On the other hand, Arsinoe II's veneration in Egyptian cult survives even in Cleopatra VII's age, that is, after the latest extant testimonies of the Greek dynastic cult (Quaegebeur 1998:83). The divinity of the brother-loving queen was promoted in successful ways in Greek cult (cf. Hauben 1983:111–114; Huß 2001:326) but it seems to have exerted an especially abiding appeal to Egyptian religious beliefs.

The obvious popularity of Arsinoe II and the sibling marriage practice of the dynasty may help explain the boom of sibling marriages in Roman Egypt. Of course, the zeal of the civic elite of Roman Egypt to remain and look as Greek as possible in front of the fiscal arrangements of the Romans was a serious motive for the intensity of the phenomenon.[40] On the other hand, sibling marriage should have been gradually connected by then also with the specific Ptolemaic tradition of the country, especially as there exist some—admittedly rare—examples for the extension of this custom among common Egyptian people before the Romans.[41]

To conclude, personal feeling and *raison d'état* seem to have been dexterously combined in the case of the Ptolemaic sibling marriage.

[40] This motive has been properly stressed by Modrzejewski 1989:275; 1993[2]. See also n. 12 above.

[41] The idea of a possible continuity in the practice of private sibling marriage between the Ptolemaic and the Roman period of Egypt had already been the basic idea of Thierfelder 1960, and then found some support in two cases of the former period: Modrzejewski 1999:272; Shaw 1992:287. On an eventual influence of the royal example on the Ptolemaic subjects: Vérilhac and Vial 1998:99.

Philadelphos adapted to the highest ideological level of the local traditions of the land he and his descendants were to govern. He managed to increase his family's popularity by following and elevating to regular dynastic practice a distinguished trait of Egyptian religion though much less of Pharaonic tradition. He chose to identify himself with and project the aspect of local culture that suited both his personality and the internal balance of his kingdom, and he chose wisely. After all, not just the body of Alexander but also an important part of his political wisdom towards non-Greeks may have constituted vital capitals of Ptolemaic Alexandria.

THROUGH A WOMAN'S EYES, AND IN A WOMAN'S VOICE: IHWERET AS FOCALIZOR IN THE *FIRST TALE OF SETNE KHAEMWAS*[*]

Steve Vinson

One of the principal problems of the Ptolemaic Egyptian *First Tale of Setne Khaemwas*[1] is to explain its employment of what is, in the context of Egyptian *belles lettres*, an extremely unusual device: a major subplot presented through a long first-person narration by a female character, Ihweret. For a significant portion of the tale, Ihweret narrates the story of her brother and husband, the magician and prince Naneferkaptah, who undertakes a disastrous search for a magic book written by the god Thoth himself. In narratological terms, this tale is 'focalized' through Ihweret.

Focalization—which is a property of any narrative,[2] however presented, and whether fictional or not—can be external, through a nar-

[*] J. Johnson (ed.), *The Demotic Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* abbreviated as *CDD*. *CT*: Adriaan de Buck, et al., *The Egyptian Coffin Texts* 1–8. Oriental Institute Publications 34, 49, 64, 67, 73, 81, 87, 132 (Chicago, 1935–2006). *Wb*: Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, eds., *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache* 1–7 (Leipzig, 1926–1963). *DNb*: Erich Lüddeckens, et al., eds., *Demotisches Namenbuch* 1.1–18 (Wiesbaden, 1980–2000). *LdÄ*: Wolfgang Helck, et al., eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 1–7 (Wiesbaden, 1972–1992). Erickson, *DG*: W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen, 1954). Crum, *CD*: W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1939). Gardiner, *EG*: Alan H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Third Edition, Oxford and London, 1957).

[1] For photographs of the text, see now S. Goldbrunner, *Der verblendete Gelehrte*; also W. Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen Denkmäler* 2, plates 44–47. Initial decipherment: Brugsch, *Roman de Setnau* (1867). Goldbrunner includes a modern transliteration and annotated German translation, but the fundamental philological study remains that of Griffith, *Stories*, 13ff. and 82ff. Accessible modern English translations include Ritner, trans., "Setna I" and Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:127–138. For other Setne stories, see n. 16 below.

[2] The very definition of narrative is problematic, and there is no real consensus either within literary theory broadly speaking, or among Egyptological scholars of literature, on what the specific characteristics of 'narrative' are; nor—particularly problematic for Egyptology—on which genres or categories of texts should be considered completely or partly 'narrative.' Largely following Bal (*Narratology*, 5 and 19) and especially Chatman (*Coming to Terms*, 8ff.), I adopt a very expansive view of narrative: that it is the semiotic representation of action and/or a process, which action/process is either instigated or undergone by persons or other personified entities, and which is

rator who is not a character in the story.[3] Or it can be internal—that is, through the mind of one of the story's characters. In either case, the question is: "who sees"? Internal focalization can be signaled in a variety of ways, but in fiction or in drama, direct first-person retrospective speech (or ego narrative) is perhaps the most obvious way for an author to make it clear that we are seeing events unfold from the perspective of a specific character in the story, with everything that may entail. That said, the correlative question–"who speaks?"–must also be kept in mind in addressing issues of focalization; as we see more than once in Ihweret's narration, the most immediate focalizor and the narrator are not necessarily the same entity.[4]

In searching for an explanation for the *First Setne* author's choice of such an unusual mode of presentation, two categories of questions arise. The first comprises historic questions: viewed diachronically, does this particular technique have any direct or indirect antecedents that we can point to in the long tradition of Egyptian literature? And, viewed synchronically, is there anything about the culture of Ptolemaic Egypt specifically that might have encouraged our author to frame the tale in this way? The second category comprises hermeneutic questions:

---

posited to exist outside of, and prior to, the narrative. And, just as the process unfolds in time, so too a 'narrative'–or the narrative elements of an otherwise-non-narrative composition—has its own internal narrative time. The process and any sub-processes may be termed the narrative's 'fabula,' a term coined by the Russian formalist Viktor Shklovskii. Its correlative term is 'sjuzhet,' the way in which the fabula is realized in a concrete instance of narration (on the terms, see Shklovskii, *Theory of Prose*). Although the terms have only recently found their way into Egyptological literary scholarship (e.g., Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites*, 230), a generally similar distinction underlies the discussion of myth in Assmann, "Zeugung;" *idem*, "Verborgenheit;" Baines, "Myth and Discourse;" *idem*, "Myth and Literature;" and Frankfurt, "Narrating Power," esp. 474. The term 'semiotic' is used advisedly. At least three categories of signs can convey information about a fabula: language, physical action, and images. On the narrative nature of 'dramatic' compositions (plays as well as films), see Markantonatos, *Tragic Narrative*; Chatman, *Coming to Terms*.

[3] On focalization, see Bal, *Narratology*, 100ff. An external focalizor may be only implied, as in the case of third-person-omniscient narration. However, the identity of a narrator/external focalizor may be made explicit in the case of a character in a frame-story who narrates an embedded story in which she or he is not a character, paradigmatically in the case of Sheherazade in the *One Thousand and One Nights*. In Egyptian *belles lettres*, an example would be Bauefre, who narrates the tale of Snefru and Djadjaemankh in Papyrus Westcar (text in Blackman, *King Kheops*; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1:215–222 [216–217 for Snefru and Djadjaemankh]; Simpson 2003, 13–24 [16–18 for Snefru and Djadjaemankh]). An external focalizor will probably be at the top level of a multi-level focalization.

[4] Ball, *Narratology*, 101.

what literary purpose is served in presenting the tale in this way? What meanings are suggested by focalizing the tale through Ihweret? What is gained that might otherwise not be present in the story if it had been presented in the third person, or in the voice of Naneferkaptah himself?

In this chapter, I will argue that the key to understanding Ihweret's role in the tale is to recall that the only female character who is consistently encountered in major speaking roles—including many instances of first-person narration—in a wide variety of Egyptian compositions and genres is the goddess Isis. The tale of Naneferkaptah acquires meaning in large measure through its resonance with the myth of Isis and Osiris. However, the tale is not a straightforward allegorical restatement of the classic Osiris myth, in the manner of the Ramesside 'Blinding of Truth by Falsehood'. Instead, the story of Naneferkaptah, both in its own internal structure and in the way in which it functions in the larger context of *First Setne*, goes beyond the classical myth, responding to new cultural developments characteristic of Hellenistic Egypt, and most especially building on the special place that Isis had in Graeco-Roman Egyptian religion.

To be sure, Ihweret's tale is in some respects situated squarely within the mainstream of Egyptian fictional narrative as it crystalized in the pharaonic period. First-person narration is among the commonest of Egyptian story-telling techniques.[5] Well-known examples of tales told primarily in the first person include the *Shipwrecked Sailor*[6] and the *Story of Sinuhe*,[7] both from the Egyptian Middle Kingdom; or the *Report of Wenamun* from the terminal New Kingdom/early Third Intermediate Period.[8] Ihweret's narration in *First Setne*, however, is different these and from most other examples of first-person narration in Egyptian tales in at least four significant ways. First, in the great majority of instances of first-person narration in fictional tales, the narrator is male. Secondly, nearly all other Egyptian first-person narrative is put in the mouth of the central character in the narrative. A first-person narrator like Sinuhe or Wenamun recounts his own story, not someone

[5] See in general Suhr, "Zum fiktiven Erzähler."

[6] Text in Blackman, *Middle Egyptian Stories*, 41–48; English translations in Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1: 211–215; Simpson 2003.

[7] Text in Koch, *Sinuhe*; English translations in Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1: 222–235; Simpson 2003.

[8] Text in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 61–76; English translations in Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 224–230; Wente, trans., "The Report of Wenanum." For the date: Baines, "Wenamun as a Literary Text," 329.

else's. Thirdly, most Egyptian first-person narration is almost pure 'ego narrative' in the sense that the narrator typically recounts only what he, himself, directly experienced. That is to say, the answers to the questions 'Who acts?' 'Who sees?' and 'Who speaks?' are all identical. And finally, Egyptian fictional narratives of all kinds typically have happy endings: the hero survives his ordeal and re-establishes his place in Egyptian life; the villain (if there is one) is decisively punished.[9]

But in Ihweret's narration in *First Setne*, not only do we have a rare example of a story told by a woman; here we have a story told by a person who, though she had participated in many of the events that she narrates, speaks primarily as a witness.[10] Further, Ihweret's narration departs from true 'ego narrative' in that she also recounts a number of events that she could not have witnessed, either because they occurred in the world of the gods, or because they occurred in this world after her own death. Yet, in these cases, Ihweret does not fully narrate her own experience of having learned of the events. Rather, Ihweret herself becomes in effect a third-person, omniscient narrator, and the characters whose actions she narrates, in one case the god Thoth, in another her brother Naneferkaptah, now both act and focalize the action. That is to say, in Ihweret's tale, we have a number of instances of multi-level focalization which, in comparison with most preserved Egyptian narrative fiction, are unusually complex.[11] Finally, Ihweret's tale is quite literally tragic, in that it recounts the story of an essentially good man who is destroyed for defying the gods and

[9] See my "The Accent's on Evil."

[10] Similarly Quack, *Demotische und gräko-ägyptische Literatur*, 18.

[11] On levels of focalization, see Bal, *Narratology*, 110ff. Following Bal, the way in which, e.g., the focalization of Naneferkaptah's internal monologue on whether or not to return to Memphis following the deaths of Ihweret and Merib (*First Setne* 4.17–19; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:132; Ritner, trans., "Setna I", 461) could be diagramed as follows: EF—[np CF1 ('I-present')]—[np CF2 ('I-past')]—[np CF3 (Naneferkaptah)]—[np (alternatives)], where an implied external focalizor (EF; the third-person narrator of the frame story) focalizes the narration of the first character focalizor (CF1) Ihweret in the story's present; who focalizes the prior experiences of her earlier self (CF2); who focalizes Naneferkaptah (CF3); who focalizes the alternatives before him. At none of these levels is there an instance of a focalizor physically perceiving what is being focalized, so in each case the focalized object is non-perceptible (np). This case is actually somewhat ambiguous because it is not made clear precisely when and how Ihweret will have learned of Naneferkaptah's interior monologue, which took place after her own death. It is thus unclear precisely where to draw the line between the 'present' and 'past' Ihwerets. It might be preferable to think of the levels of the past Ihweret and the monologue of Naneferkaptah as parallel, not sequential, both focalized by the current Ihweret.

transgressing *mɜʿ.t* (*maʿat*), the moral order of the universe. In most other Egyptian tales that end with the punishment or destruction of a character, that character is quite clearly marked as a villain, with no redeeming characteristics.[12]

The method we will pursue in this contribution is to: (1) Survey the types of non-divine female characters that appear in earlier Egyptian fictional narrative. (2) Discuss the range of genres and texts in which Isis appears as a speaker, and especially as a narrator. (3) Explore the ways in which Ihweret is an obviously—or, as the case may be, unobviously—Isis-like character. (4) Conclude with a discussion of the ways in which Ihweret's resonances with Isis help us to understand her as a character, and more broadly *First Setne* itself, both as a work of literature and in its cultural/historical context. But to set the stage for this investigation, I first present a short description and summary of the story.

First Setne

First Setne is the best-preserved of a number of Graeco-Roman Egyptian tales that deal with a character named Setne Khaemwas. This character, who is presented as a not-overly-competent magician, is the fictional counterpart of a real Khaemwas, a son of Ramses II.[13] The historic Khaemwas was, among other things, the high priest of the god Ptah in Memphis, and in that capacity bore the religious title *sm*, the basic meaning of which is unfortunately not clear. From the Nineteenth Dynasty forward, this religious title is occasionally spelled with an intrusive consonant *t*, so that in hieroglyphic/hieratic, the spelling *stm* appears.[14] The spelling *stm* is also common in Demotic, alongside a further development, *stn*.[15] The scribe of *First Setne* used a form (*Stne*) based on this last spelling, but a number of other Setne stories, including the *Second Tale of Setne Khaemwas*, use spellings based on *stm*. By the time Khaemwas' legendary persona had crystalized, it seems that the title had come to be regarded as a component of his personal name, and in fact 'Setne' (or variants) is used far more often for Khaemwas'

[12] On this, see my "The Accent's on Evil."
[13] See in general Gomaà, *Chaemwese*; Fisher, *Sons of Ramses II*, 1:89–105; 2:89–143.
[14] *Wb*. 4, 119, 3–9.
[15] Erichsen, *DG*, 479.

literary alter-ego than the full form 'Setne Khaemwas.' For this reason, it is not certain that all characters called 'Setne' in the Demotic tales in this group—some of which are quite fragmentary—are necessarily to be identified with 'Setne Khaemwas.'[16]

The one existing manuscript, housed in the Cairo Museum under the number CGC 30646, is dated to year 15, the first month of *pr.t* (emergence) season—that is, the month of Tybi—of an unnamed king. In view of the colophon's silence on the reign in which the manuscript was produced, the papyrus' precise historical position remains uncertain. Francis Llewelyn Griffith's impression was that the text is late Ptolemaic or early Roman.[17] Wilhelm Spiegelberg, however, thought that the character of the writing "stark an die aus der Zeit des Ptol. Euergetes I. (i.e., Ptolemy III) datierten Texte von Elephantine (erin-

[16] Aside from *First Setne*, only the Roman-era "Second Tale of Setne Khaemwas," is essentially complete; see Griffith, *Stories*, 41ff. (translation), 142ff. (transliteration and philological notes); Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3: 138–151; Ritner, trans., "Setna II;" *idem*, "Childhood of Si-Osire." Two fragmentary stories appear to be closely related to *First Setne*, with both mentioning the character Naneferkaptah. The first of these is preserved in one column of a Ptolemaic-era manuscript; see CGC 30692 in Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen Denkmäler*, 2: 112–115 and plate 51; further discussion and important corrections by Zauzich, "schlimme Geschichte." A second tale, which comprises a number of fragments from Copenhagen and Florence (PSI inv. DG + Carlsberg 423), will be published by Richard Jasnow; see Ryholt, "Tebtunis Temple Library," 155 (my thanks to Dr. Ryholt for this information and reference). For a Roman-era Setne story that does not preserve any mention of the name Khaemwas, see Tait, "Two columns of a Setna-text;" additional discussion and improved readings in Quack and Ryholt, *Miscellany of Demotic Texts*, 141–163. Additionally, in the Roman P Petese Tebtunis A+B, 8.2, there is a mention of a *stm* who does not appear to have a central role in the story; see Ryholt, *Petese*, 20 (transliteration) and 58 (translation). Two other more distantly-related tales mention a *stm*-priest named Ptahhotep; see the fragmentary CGC 30758 (Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen Denkmäler*, 2:145–148 and plate 58); and P Dem. Saq. 1, 7.×+3; 14.20–21 (Smith and Tait, *Saqqâra Demotic Papyri I*, 1–69, pls. 1–3). The story of a pharaoh and priest of Hephaistos (Ptah) named 'Sethon' (?) in Herodotus 2.141 has been considered by some to be linked to the broader Setne tradition—that is, with stories about priests who bore the title, if not necessarily about the specific character Setne Khaemwas; see Griffith, *Stories*, 1–12; Rutherford, "Kalasiris and Setne Khaemwas," 205; Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 454. The equation of this 'Sethon' with the character name or title 'Setne' depends in part on the identity of this 'Sethon' as priest of Hephaistos/Ptah, but largely on the final *-n* of the name as given in Herodotus. However—as Griffith concedes—Herodotus' text gives the name only in the accusative case, so it cannot be ruled out that the nominative form will have been 'Sethos,' a name that would instead suggest some connection to, or conflation with, one of the Egyptian pharaohs named Sety. Further doubts expressed by Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 98–182*, 100 *ad loc*.

[17] Griffith, *Stories*, 14.

nert),"[18] and a date early in the Ptolemaic period continues to be the modern *opinio communis*.[19] If the manuscript belongs to Ptolemy II, the colophon would point to a completion date of late February/late March, 268 BCE; if to Ptolemy III, then mid-February/mid-March, 232 BCE.

First Setne concerns a magic book written by Egypt's god of magic and writing Thoth. The story is actually presented as two parallel subplots, structured as a third-person framing story and a first-person embedded tale, linked by a unifying ending. Although the use of a framing story is common in Egyptian narrative fiction, *First Setne* is unusual—if not unique—in having a framing story and an embedded story that are both fully-worked-out, extended tales, each with its own structure and with its own (albeit partly-overlapping) cast of characters. The two tales are also thematically very closely linked, parallel in structure, and, in important respects, precise inversions of one another in their respective tones. That is, *First Setne* provides a relatively rare instance of an Egyptian tale with an embedded narrative and a primary narrative that are 'mirror-texts' of one another.[20]

Although the first two columns of the story are missing, the tale undoubtedly begins with the third-person framing story. Setne, ostensibly the 'hero' of the story, will have learned, likely from an aged priest, that a magic book written by Thoth himself was to be found in the tomb of a certain Naneferkaptah, a long-dead magician and prince. He will have broken into the tomb, which was located in the royal necropolis near the capital of Memphis. There he will have confronted the mummy of Naneferkaptah, along with the ghost (*3h*) of Naneferkaptah's wife and sister Ihweret, and that of the couple's child, Merib. Ihweret and Merib were not physically present in the tomb–they were actually buried in the distant town of Koptos, near ancient Thebes. Their ghosts were in the tomb only through the craft of a good scribe, magic performed by Naneferkaptah. Ihweret will have attempted to dissuade Setne from his purpose, and to this end will have begun to tell Setne the story of how she and her husband came to be in possession of the book.

---

[18] Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen Denkmäler*, 2: 88.

[19] Most recently Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 454.

[20] For the term, see Bal, *Narratology*, 144–146, esp. 146. In *The Shipwrecked Sailor*, the tales of the Sailor and of the Snake might also be regarded as 'mirror' texts, in that both treat themes of loss and perseverance, and both include sudden natural disasters that leave their respective heros bereft. On the other hand, the simplicity and brevity of the embedded tale told by the Snake in *Shipwrecked Sailor* distinguishes it significantly from Ihweret's complex tale in *First Setne*.

The preserved text of the tale begins at this point, with Setne in the tomb and the embedded story underway, narrated in the first person by Ihweret's ghost. Ihweret has apparently described how she and Naneferkaptah had fallen in love, and now goes on to explain how she had persuaded their father the Pharaoh to allow them to marry. She next recounts how Naneferkaptah had been accosted by an aged priest who had informed him of the existence of the book, and offered to tell him where it was to be found. Ihweret then narrates Naneferkaptah's own theft of the magic book, and its disastrous sequel. Following Naneferkaptah's seizure of the book, the sun-god Pre had decreed death for Ihweret and Merib, which drove Naneferkaptah to kill himself. Worse yet, the family then found itself separated in eternity, a fate that reflected an already-implicit estrangement between Naneferkaptah and Ihweret, who had strongly opposed the project from the first.

As the third-person frame story recommences, Ihweret expresses the hope that her tale will convince Setne to leave the book and the tomb in peace. But Setne will have none of it. Using his own magic power, Setne escapes from the tomb with the book. But Setne then undergoes a terrifying encounter with a mysterious woman named Tabubue, in which he appears to agree to the murder of his own children in exchange for sex. Fortunately, we learn that this is an illusion, apparently arranged by Naneferkaptah. Setne now resolves to return the book, and all turns out for the best. Setne reconciles with Naneferkaptah, then fetches the mummies of Ihweret and Merib from Koptos for reburial along with Naneferkaptah—locating the long-lost tomb with the help of Naneferkaptah, who appears in the guise of an aged priest to guide Setne to the correct place. The estrangement between husband and wife is thus resolved, and the reader is left with the distinct impression that Naneferkaptah had arranged everything as an elaborate scheme to reunite himself with his family—indeed, that it was probably he who tempted Setne to steal the book in the first place.

Women in pre-Ptolemaic Egyptian Fictional Narrative

As a general rule, pharaonic Egyptian fiction tended to relegate non-divine female characters to secondary roles.[21] (I use the term 'non-divine' here somewhat loosely, to refer to females who are not among

[21] See in general Baines, "Wenamun as a Literary Text," 226–227.

the great gods with their own cults; some of the characters I discuss here are in fact part of the divine/mythical/fairy-tale world.) Extended speeches by female characters are rare, and those who do get to speak at length are often presented in a rather dim light. No female character actually appears in the *Shipwrecked Sailor*.[22] The women of the household of Sesostris I make a brief speaking appearance at the end of the Middle Kingdom *Story of Sinuhe*, as they welcome the aged Sinuhe back to the royal court after his years of exile in Palestine. In this instance, the women are part of Sinuhe's reintegration into Egypt and Egyptianness, and certainly are not portrayed negatively. But in the late Middle Kingdom Papyrus Westcar tales, no non-divine female is presented as anything other than foolish at best, positively evil at worst. The first with even a minimal speaking role is the adulterous wife of the lector priest Weba'iner, who is burned alive for betraying her husband.[23] The first to speak at length is a harem girl who has dropped a piece of jewelry into the river, and importunes the pharaoh Snefru to get it back for her. Here the impression is of a flighty young girl who mouths off to someone she should not mouth off to, and who is protected only by the king's weakness for scantily-clad young ladies.[24] Later in the tale, a less-fortunate servant girl is beaten and then devoured by a crocodile after she announces her intention to tell the pharaoh Khufu that the first three kings of the Fifth Dynasty—that is, the one that will supplant Khufu's own family line—have been born.[25]

In the New Kingdom's Late Egyptian tales, non-divine females with speaking roles are negative characters more often than not. The best example is the unnamed wife of Anubis, the elder brother in the *Tale of Two Brothers*.[26] Here a female character actually does narrate a short first-person tale. But the tale is a lie—a false accusation of rape against Anubis' younger brother Bata. The accusation drives the two brothers

---

[22] Females are mentioned in the tale in the context of a brief narration of an incident in which a 'falling star' had wiped out the entire family of the divine snake who holds sway on the magical island, including his beloved young daughter; and in a brief mention of the wife of the Shipwrecked Sailor, in the context of a prediction that the Sailor will return home to kiss her and embrace his children.

[23] P Westcar 4.9–10; Simpson, trans., "King Cheops and the magicians", 16 (this portion of the tale is not translated in Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1).

[24] P Westcar 12.25–26; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1: 216–217; Simpson, trans., "King Cheops and the magicians", 16–17.

[25] P Westcar 5.15ff.; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1: 222; Simpson, trans., "King Cheops and the magicians", 24.

[26] Text in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 9–30; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 203–211; Wente, trans., "The Tale of Two Brothers."

apart and, when the truth is discovered, results in the woman's own death at Anubis' hand when the truth is discovered. Later in the tale, the gods fashion a wife for Bata, who has gone into self-imposed exile in Syria-Palestine. But this unnamed woman (perhaps a reincarnation of the wife of Anubis)[27] is lured to Egypt by Pharaoh, and repeatedly betrays Bata. First she asks the Pharaoh to cut down an evergreen tree, on top of which Bata had mystically deposited his heart. Later, Bata appears to her in Egypt in bull-form, and she persuades the Pharaoh to kill the bull and permit her to eat its liver. And when Bata is reincarnated as a pair of persea trees, she asks Pharaoh to have the trees cut down. At this juncture, Bata gets the last laugh: his wife inadvertently swallows a fragment of one of the persea trees as it is being chopped down, and it is through this that his soul enters her in order to be reborn yet again.[28]

A similar example of a Late Egyptian *femme fatale* is the unnamed woman who takes the character Truth (Ma'at) into her home in *The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood*.[29] Like the evil wife of Anubis, this woman too conceives a powerful sexual desire for a helpless male character who in this case seems to be willing and able to oblige her. She has Truth's child, but nevertheless keeps Truth as her servant rather than making him her husband—leading Truth's son to reject her and express a wish for her death when he learns who his father is and how he has been treated.

A contrary example of a faithful spouse is to be found in the *Tale of the Doomed Prince*, in which the young Egyptian prince's wife, a princess from Naharin, clearly loves him and makes every effort to protect him from his fated death.[30] Unfortunately, the end of the tale is lost but the general tone of the story suggests that—like the great majority of Egyptian stories—it probably has a happy ending. And the female characters in *Wenamun* are generally sympathetic, but again,

---

[27] Baines, "Wenamun as a Literary Text," 226.

[28] For the motif of metempsychosis effected through the mother-to-be's consumption of a plant that contains a soul awaiting reincarnation, see also *Second Setne*, 1.3 (Griffith, *Stories*, 144–145; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:138; Ritner, trans., "Setna II," 472). However, rather than Griffith's *qmqmy* (?), 'gourd (?)' (followed by Lichtheim and Ritner), read *nwn*, 'root;' see *CDD*, N-volume, 44.

[29] Text in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 30–36. Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 211–214; Wente, trans., "The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood."

[30] Text in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 1–9. Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 200–203. Wente, trans., "The Tale of the Doomed Prince."

not especially prominent.[31] The only one of the three who speaks is Hatiba, the ruler of Alashiya (Cyprus).[32] In no case are these female characters either the dramatic centers or the narratological focalizors of their respective tales.

Isis as a Literary Character

The examples in the preceding section, from some of the best-known Middle and New Kingdom tales, should serve to show how unusual Ihweret is in the broader history of Egyptian fiction—both in her positive characterization and in her complex role as a teller of both first- and third-person stories. Among non-divine fictional characters, there is really no pharaonic precedent for a female speaking, let along telling a story, at any great length. The only real antecedents in any Egyptian narrative literature to the role that Ihweret takes on in *First Setne* are the roles that the goddess Isis takes on as a prominent literary character and as a story-teller in her own right. With the possible exceptions of her husband/brother Osiris and her son Horus, no divinity from ancient Egypt has a more developed narrative cycle than Isis. And none, not excepting Osiris and Horus, is more directly involved in actual narration or in other instances of extended direct speech.

Three things are especially noteworthy about this. In the first place, although Isis' role as literary character has a long history, she becomes ever more prominent in the literature of the New Kingdom and the Late and Graeco-Roman periods. In part, this is because mythological literature itself is produced in ever greater quantity at this time.[33] But also during these years, Isis' own position vis-à-vis the other gods becomes more and more pronounced.[34] This means that, to the extent that the Ptolemaic Ihweret is an Isis-like figure, we should (as we would expect) link her not merely the Isis of age-old myth, but specifically to

[31] Baines, "Wenamun as a Literary Text," 226–227.

[32] Wenamun, 2.83; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 229; Wente, trans., "The Report of Wenamun," 123–124.

[33] Baines, "Myth and Discourse," 92; Assmann, "Verborgenheit," 9; Sternberg, *Mythische Motiven*, 15–16.

[34] One interesting manifestation of this—among many—is the inauguration of the formal practice of burial of the mother of the Apis bull, who was identified with Isis, in the late Saite period; see Smith, "Death and Life of the Mother of Isis," 217.

the Isis who had by the Graeco-Roman period became a truly universal divinity.[35]

In the second place, Isis' role as a speaker and narrator is intimately bound up with her mythological role as protector and helper of her brother/spouse Osiris and their son Horus. Many of the examples we have of Isis as speaker or narrator are instrumentally connected to this role. There are two aspects to this. In part, Isis' role as protector is closely connected to her knowledge of magic, which is actualized through her speech. As the Louvre Osiris hymn expresses it:

> His sister has made his protection: (Namely,) the one who has driven away the malevolent ones; the one who drives away the deeds of the mischievous with the effectiveness (*ꜣḫ*) of her speech; the excellent of tongue, whose words do not fail; she who is effective of command…[36]

Many of the preserved narrative texts connected to Isis, comprising a great deal of Isis' quoted speech and a great deal of Isis' own direct first-person narration, come in the context of *historiolae*, narrative mythological episodes embedded in magical spells. By using them, the magician hoped to 'piggyback' onto Isis' role as magician and to re-enact for his own benefit (or the benefit of a client) some primordial episode in which she had efficaciously employed her power.[37] But the second major locus of her action as a speaker and narrator is in her capacity as mourner by the bier of the slain Osiris. Much of Isis' quoted speech, including narration, appears in the context of rituals that re-enact Isis' mourning over her brother, in which dead persons were identified with Osiris and, it was hoped and expected, taken under the protection of Isis.

Finally, magic and mourning rituals are not at all the only contexts in which Isis speaks or narrates—she appears in genres of all kinds, including free-standing tales, 'dramatic' texts, and many other types of ritual compositions. Even when Isis appears in texts that are not primarily narrative, still we will often find embedded within them brief instances of minimal narration or else what might be termed 'incipient narration': descriptions, names, or existential statements that

---

[35] Schulz, "Warum Isis," 253; Dunand, "syncrétisme isiaque," 87ff.; Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 328.

[36] Louvre stela C286, early Eighteenth Dynasty, ls. 13–14; see Moret, "légende d'Osiris," 93; Assmann, *Hymnen und Gebete*, 446. Cf. the comments of Sternberg, *Mythische Motive*, 217, n. 2.

[37] Frankfurter, "Narrating Power;" Schulz, "Warum Isis," 256–257.

evoke, rather than narrate, known or presumed mythological fabulae. It cannot be emphasized enough that, although Isis' husband Osiris and her son Horus are kings of their respective domains and that her formal role is to support and protect them, nevertheless Isis is far more active in the mythical world than either of the two male figures with whom she is most closely associated.[38] As a result, she is a far more prominent, and a far more complexly layered, literary character than any other Egyptian divinity.

Isis in Tales

The best-known narrative literature that deals with Isis includes free-standing tales like the primary narration of Middle Egyptian Papyrus Westcar, and the New Kingdom *Contendings of Horus and Seth*,[39] in both of which Isis figures prominently. In P Westcar, Isis is the most prominent speaker among the gods;[40] in *Horus and Seth*, Isis also speaks extensively, and she also narrates a short lying tale herself in order to trap Seth.[41] As far as we know, these are tales that, in the form in which we have them, may well have been intended simply as entertainment fiction.[42]

But most other preserved Isis tales, whether related in the third or first person or—as not seldom happens—in mixed form, appear as *historiolae*.[43] The best known of these are the Nineteenth Dynasty *Tale of Isis and the Secret Name of Re* (third-person, but with substantial direct speech by Isis);[44] and the *Tale of Isis, the Rich Woman, and the Marsh Woman* (first-person narration by Isis) attested from the Nineteenth Dynasty into the Ptolemaic period, most famously as one of the texts inscribed

[38] See also the comments of Sternberg, *Mythische Motive*, 223–224 on the passivity of Osiris; we discuss this in more detail below.

[39] Text in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 37–60. Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 214–224; Wente, trans., "The Contendings of Horus and Seth."

[40] P Westcar 10.7 ff. See Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 1: 220; Simpson 2003, 22–23; in which Isis takes the lead among the divinities assisting with the birth of the children of Ruddedet.

[41] *Horus and Seth*, 6.4 ff.; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 217; Wente, "Contendings of Horus and Seth," 96.

[42] Categorized as "Unterhaltungsliteratur," "Entertainment literature," by Blumenthal, "Erzählung des Papyrus d'Orbiney," 15, and Assmann, "Kulturelle und literarische Texte," 77 ff.

[43] See in general Frankfurter, "Narrating Power."

[44] P Turin 1993 vs. 6.11–9.5. Bourghout, *Egyptian Magical Texts*, text 84.

on the Metternich Stela in Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City.[45] Many other magical texts include longer or shorter snippets of stories about Isis, stories which were or presumably might have been more fully developed in oral literature or in written narrative literature now lost to us. Often these short fragments of narration involve Isis hiding and protecting the infant Horus from Seth and his allies, or curing him of various afflictions. One particularly unusual one appears in the magical papyrus P BM 10042, rt. 7.8–12,[46] which presents an Oedipal episode that begins with Isis magically stopping the flow of water in the Nile, exposing the fish on the river bottom:

> Isis struck with her wing; she sealed the mouth of the river.[47] She caused the fish to lie down on the mud; the waves did not cover it. Isis became weary ⟨on⟩ the water. Isis arose ⟨on⟩ the water, her tears falling into the water. See, Horus has copulated with his mother Isis! Her tears are falling into the water.

---

[45] See Klasens, *Magical Statue Base*, Spell I; 9–19 (synoptic text); 52–53 (translation) = Borghouts, *Magical Texts*, text 90 (Borghouts, *Magical Texts*, 122, adding O Gardiner 333 to the eight exemplars used by Klasens). Other *historiolae* that present Isis narrating in the first person include: (1) Middle Kingdom P Ramesseum III, B.23–34 = Borghouts, *Magical Texts*, text 69 (Isis recounts a desperate search for Horus, who had suckled a *bꜥ*-demon from her breast); (2) Nineteenth-Dynasty P Leiden I 348 rt. 3.8–4.3 = Borghouts, *Magical Texts* text 45 (very brief retrospective allusion to the episode in the "Contendings of Horus and Seth" in which Horus decapitates Isis and she receives a cow's head as substitute); (3) Ptolemaic Metternich Stela 168–251 = Socle Behague ×+c.1-g.1; Klasens, *Magical Statue Base* 22–34 (text), 54–58 (translation) = Borghouts, *Magical Texts*, text 91 (complex and lengthy text, which includes both an extended first-person narration by Isis of her discovery of the infant Horus ill from a scorpion bite, as well as extended third-person narration); (4) a Roman-era Demotic spell from the magical papyrus P London-Leiden Magical, vo. 20.1–5, Griffith and Thompson, *Demotic Magical Papyrus*, 193; cf. also Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites*, 141 with n. 103 (first-person narration in which Isis reports that Amun has cured Horus by means of striking him on the head with three spells written in the Nubian language; cf. *First Setne*, in which Naneferkaptah strikes Setne on the head three times with a game board, causing him to sink into the ground a little further with each blow; see Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:133; Ritner, trans., "Setna I", 462). In many other spells, Isis speaks directly, but does not actually narrate. Among the most interesting of these are a *historiola* from P London-Leiden rt. 20.1ff. (Griffith and Thompson, *Demotic Magical Papyrus* 1: 128–129; 3: Plate 20), a first-person narration by Anubis, with considerable direct speech by Isis, recounting how Isis rescued Anubis from Syria (*p3 t3 n Ḫr*), inhabited at that time by cannibals (*wnm-rmṯ*, 'man eaters'); and a first-person declamation by Isis of her magical power, a text attested in the Nineteenth Dynasty (in P Turin 1993 and P Chester-Beatty 11) and in the Ptolemaic period (Socle Behague); see Klasens, *Magical Statue Base*, Text V, 35–36 (text), 58–59 (translation); we will return to this text below.

[46] Borghouts, *Magical Texts*, text 129.

[47] Cf. Socle Behague Spell IV, f 26; Klasens, *Magical Statue Base* 32 (text), 57

In point of fact, one might not go far wrong in characterizing Ihweret's own narration in *First Setne* as a sort of extended *historiola*: a tale of an episode in the past, one in which the gods figure, and which is intended to prefigure and influence the future. And indeed, Ihweret's tale does point forward to the magical forces that come to bear on Setne and that compel him to return the Magic Book of Thoth to the tomb of Naneferkaptah.

Isis in Dramas and Quasi-dramatic Rituals

Isis figures prominently in what appear to have been publicly performed dramas like the *Triumph of Horus* at Edfu (in which she is given the most to say of any character, and in which she has the most complexly-delineated personality),[48] as well as quasi-dramatic rituals like the *Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys* and related texts in which, so it seems, priests or acolytes will have assumed the personas of the relevant divinities in ceremonies which, in all likelihood, were restricted to the participants themselves.[49] In either case, 'actors' will have either declaimed speeches ascribed to their respective divinities, as well as

(translation): "The (Nile) source is blocked; the crops are withered, food is taken from humanity, until Horus is healthy for his mother Isis."

[48] On Isis' characterization see Fairman, *Triumph of Horus*, 26.

[49] Aside from the lamentations, the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys* also thematizes the mourning of Isis and Nephthys; see Faulkner, *The Papyrus Bremner-Rhind* (text); *idem*, "The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus—I" (translation). Other texts that dramatize mourning for Osiris, but that include a larger cast of characters, include the "hourly watch ritual," in which Isis generally speaks in the role of one of the two kites (*dr.ty*), occasionally in a solo declamation (e.g., E.I. 41ff.; Junker, *Stundenwachen*, 35ff.), occasionally in duet (e.g., E XIII, 61ff.; Junker, *Stundenwachen*, 70ff.); the *Glorification Ritual of Osiris* and the *Glorification Ritual of the Festival of the Valley* (editions in Haikal, *Funerary Papyri* 1 and 2; for the *Glorification Ritual of Osiris*, see now Goyon, *Papyrus d'Imouthès* 49–62); and the *Great Decree Promulgated for the District of Silence* see Goyon, *Papyrus d'Imouthès*, 17–48. Isis also speaks at considerable length in the *Ritual of Overthrowing Seth* (Schott, Urk. VI.1), and in a Demotic drama on the struggle of Horus and Seth (Gaudard, *Demotic Drama of Horus and Seth*). Most of these compositions are best known in texts of the Ptolemaic period, but are generally thought to have their roots in far older literature; for example, Isis speaks at length in the *Birth and Apotheosis of Horus*, which may be an extract or citation from a quasi-dramatic ritual text that appears in the Coffin Text spell 148 (CT II, 209c–226a); see Fairman, *Triumph of Horus*, 10–13. On the other hand, the very frequent appearance of material of this type in the Ptolemaic period suggests that it responds to needs and interests that are, in some respects, peculiar to the later phases of Egyptian religious history. On dramatic and quasi-dramatic rituals, see now also Gillam, *Performance and Drama in Ancient Egypt*.

physically acting in ways characteristic of them; or else simply represented them while a ritualist (*ḫry-ḥb*) actually read the text. As a result, as regards their formal construction, such texts typically include indications of dialogue or at least alternating speeches ascribed to their characters; to this there may be added 'stage directions' and descriptions of objects (props) that might be employed in the 'performance.'[50]

The narrative nature of an extended dramatic text like *The Triumph of Horus at Edfu* is perhaps more obvious than that of ritual texts like the *Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys*, of which the primary fabula could be simply narrated by some such sentence as "Isis and Nephthys came to kneel by the bier of Osiris, and said the following…" The performance of this ritual and its parallels was evidently not public,[51] but an onlooker would have seen something similar to a tableau vivant consisting of two female figures kneeling besides the bier of Osiris. Nowhere in this text, neither at the level of the text's principal action, nor at the level of narratives embedded in the characters' speeches, do we find anything like a plot. Nevertheless, to the extent that such texts represent in words and actions events believed to have occurred prior to the performance, even quasi-dramatic ritual texts of the lamentations genre conform to the minimal definition of narrative that we have adopted here. It is true, however, that whatever narrative features the texts possess are largely subservient to the compositions' overall descriptive or characterizing purpose.[52] But in the end, narrative, dramatic and ritual texts dealing with Isis, Osiris and Horus all attempt to communicate similar truths—that is, they presuppose very much the same or similar fabulae. For this reason, each category of text presents, *mutatis mutandis*, many of the same themes and much of the same imagery as the others.

In most dramatic or quasi-dramatic ritual texts, it is the narratives embedded in characters' speeches that are most accessible to analysis, because a dramatic text is by definition most easily characterized by a relative lack of explicit language narrative matter at the level of the text's principal action: that is precisely the level at which past action was to be represented by performed action.[53] And for our specific

[50] Blackman and Fairman, "Myth of Horus—II" (part 1), 33.

[51] P Berlin 3008, 5.13–16; Faulkner, "Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys," 341.

[52] On the subordination of narrative to description, see Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 17–18; on narrativized description—i.e., tableaux—in specifically sacralized contexts analogous to our Egyptian examples, see *Coming to Terms*, 32, quoting Kittay, "Descriptive Limits," 239.

[53] Although this distinction is difficult to rigidly maintain, especially in the case of

problem—discussing Isis as a speaker and narrator—it is also the level of characters' speeches that most interests us. At this level, fully-developed tales are relatively rare. It is, however, worth noting that functionally, first-person *historiolae* may actually be better thought of as language narratives embedded in a quasi-drama, since they appear to have been intended for recitation by a magician who might assume the persona of a divinity in the course of a ritual; indeed, aside from the roles that a ritualist might take on personally, children might also be cast in the role of the young Horus or another child god who figured in the fabula around which the ritual was constructed.[54]

But most often, the language narratives embedded in Egyptian dramatic or quasi-dramatic texts are not so complex. Among the best examples is a lengthy speech by Isis from the *Glorification Ritual for Osiris* in which she narrates the posthumous conception of Horus and the funeral rituals performed for the murdered Osiris.[55] Here we have an instance of extended narration that falls between the minimal narration of a single event and a fully-plotted story:

> I am Isis; there is no god or goddess who has done what I have done: Even though I am a woman, I acted (the part of a) male,[56] from the desire to make your name live upon the earth. Your divine semen was

---

Egyptian dramatic or quasi-dramatic ritual texts, which often include narrative elements around the characters' speeches. In some cases (e.g., the *Memphite Theology*), those narrative elements may be quite extensive, in fact exceeding the characters' speeches. It is often unclear whether these elements were intended to be part of the 'performance' of the play/ritual, perhaps read by a narrator/ritualist; or whether they are part of the texts' adaptations into secondary contexts (i.e., monumental inscription, as in the case of the *Memphite Theology* or the *Triumph of Horus*); or whether they are 'stage directions' framed in a way that has not fully detached itself from the decorums of narrative tales. It seems possible, for example, that the Demotic *Myth of the Eye of the Sun* as we have it is actually a script for an oral performance; it reads like a straightforward narrative, but also includes the occasional notation *ḫrw=f mỉ-tzy*, "his voice thus" (e.g., 3.24; 5.10; 5.21) which would seem to be a direction to the reader to adjust his voice as appropriate for the situation or for the character who is actually speaking.

[54] See M. Stadler, "Das Kind sprach zu ihr," 315–316, with n. 27; Ritner, "Horus on the Crocodiles," 105.

[55] P BM 10208, 1.9–1.17; Haikal, *Funerary Papyri*, 1:49–52 (text); 2:51 (translation).

[56] *ỉry.n=ỉ tzy ỉw=ỉ m ḫm.t*. Haikal translates "I took a man, though being a woman" (*Funerary Papyri*, 2:51); similarly Goyon, *Papyrus d'Imouthès*, 52, with n. 7; *idem*, "Cérémonial de glorification," 111, n. 22. Transitive use of the verb *ỉrỉ* "to do" in the sense of "have sexual intercourse with" (as colloquially in English) seems a not-impossible extension of *ỉrỉ* "erwerben" of *Wb*. 2, 109, 3–4. Note also the intransitive usage in the phrase *ḫr ỉr.t m ḫm.wt*, "acting (sexually)/'doing it' with women;" see Blackman and Fairman, "The Myth of Horus—II" (part 3), 7, with note d. However translated, the essential point clear: Isis has taken the leading role in the conception of Horus, reversing the

within me; I gave birth to him (scil., Horus) so that he would defend your character, so that he would heal your suffering, and so that he would inflict great pain on the one who did it. Seth has fallen to his (own) spear; the henchmen of Seth are turned into burnt offerings. The throne of Geb is yours: you are his beloved son.

Ha'y,[57] Sokar-Osiris, Osiris *Ns-Mn*, justified, born of *Tꜣ-šr.t-n-tꜣ-ỉḥ.t*, justified! When that slaughter took place in primaeval times, there was made for you a Great Place in Busiris, in order to mummify you and to sweeten your smell. Anubis was made for you in the place of embalming, to conduct his funerary rituals, while I together with your sister Nephthys lit the lamp of the Great Place, in order to expel Seth at night. Anubis went forth from the districts of Wabet to overthrow all of your enemies. Mourners made their lamentations for you, while your son Horus overthrew your enemies, hurling the harpoon rope at Seth.

The gods stood up in lamentation over the great injury that had happened to you; they launched their voices on high, those in the horizon hearing the goddess mourning and lamenting; they saw what 'that one' (scil., Seth) did to you. Thoth stood at the door of the embalming place, reciting his ritual, so that he might make your *ba* live every day (my translation).

Isis in Self-revelation (aretalogy)

A major locus of the Graeco-Roman Isis' role as speaker and narrator is in Greek-language texts that comprise the category of self-revelation. These texts are often assimilated to the category of aretalogy but it is worth distinguishing them, both formally and in their contents, from the other sorts of texts that are typically classified in this way.[58]

---

normal, ideal pattern of male-female sexual interaction; and Goyon (in his discussion in "Cérémonial de glorification") appositely points to the common image of the conception of Horus, in which the passive Osiris lies on his back, while the active Isis (in the form of a kite) hovers above. But, with earlier translators, it seems to me that translating "act the male" makes this point more strongly, since it suggests an existential paradox (a paradox also strengthened if the translation takes account of the apparent 'emphatic' bare initial *sḏm.n=f* used to stress the following circumstantial clause). For an unambiguous parallel, cf. P Chester Beatty VII vo., 1.10–2.1: *ʿnt̂.t tꜣ ntr.t nḫt.tî(.t) s.t-ḥm.t ỉr.t ʿḥɜwty*, "Anat the goddess, she of might, woman who acts the fighter (or, male)," in Gardiner, *Chester Beatty Papyri*,1:62–63; 2: Plate 36 (I owe this reference to Nicole Hansen).

[57] A vocative interjection, often approximated in English with the archaic expression 'Ho!'

[58] On this terminological question, see Grandjean, *nouvelle arétologie*, 1ff.; Beck, "Mystery Religions," 137; Merkelbach, *Isis Regina*, 115, n. 4.

Stricto sensu, aretalogies were products of the Graeco-Roman religious experience. The word refers to oral or written compositions which relate some action by a god. In some instances, it seems that these might be narrated by *aretalógoi*, professionals who specialized in tales of the miraculous.[59] However, the actual tales told by *aretalógoi* seem to have been evanescent, and so 'aretalogy' as a category can only be approached by reference to dedications by individuals who published in monumental form narratives of divine interventions that affected them personally.

The self-revelations by Isis are related to this category in the sense that they do enumerate the excellences or miracles (*aretaí*) of the goddess, and they, too, were often commissioned and dedicated by devotees who wished to commemorate some special favor bestowed upon them.[60] However, rather than narrate specific and unique deeds of the goddess as they relate to the dedicator, the self-revelations thematize in Isis' own words aspects of her identity and deeds that are of universal significance. And they do so via the medium of a series of individual statements—some minimally narrative, others incipiently narrative or purely descriptive—that are typically introduced with strongly emphasized, anaphoric personal pronoun I (*egó*).

The best and most complete example of the monumentally-preserved Greek self-revelations is the Kyme text, which presents itself as a copy of an inscription on a stela placed in front of the Hephaistion (temple of Ptah) in Memphis.[61] Other *Sitze im Leben* are attested, especially in literature. The text that appears in the Kyme inscription also figures in abbreviated form in Diodorus Siculus, who claims to reproduce here a text written in hieroglyphic script at the grave of Isis in a place called Nysa, which Diodorus locates in Arabia.[62] An Isis self-revelation forms the center-piece of Book 11 of Apuleius' Latin novel *The Golden Ass*.[63] The self-revelations could also be recast in the second or third person, in which case self-revelation as a genre passes over into the genre-complex of hymns, eulogies, encomia, etc.[64]

---

[59] Beck, "Mystery Religions," 137.

[60] Grandjean, *nouvelle arétologie*, 6.

[61] Text editions: Harder, *Karpokrates von Chalkis*, 20f.; Bergman, *Ich bin Isis*, 301–303. Text with translation in Merkelbach, *Isis Regina*, 115–118; hypothetical back-translation into Demotic Egyptian in Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 336–339.

[62] Diodorus I.27.

[63] See Griffiths, *Isis-Book* for a comprehensive study.

[64] On the relationship between Isis' self-revelations and hymns that often treat the

Certainly the self-revelations' deployment in historiography (Diodorus) or fiction (Apuleius) is—at least—a secondary function of the form. What is unclear is whether the Greek-language self-revelations as we know them were originally intended primarily for public display, or whether their use in public contexts (Kyme, etc.) was parasitic on a less-public use that is not visible to us in the record. And, because the Kyme text and its parallels present Egyptian (or Egyptianizing) subject matter but are all in Greek, the related question of whether they originate in the Egyptian or Greek milieu is still an open one.[65]

Even though the ancient tradition as reported in Diodorus Siculus holds that the text of the self-revelation at Nysa was written in hieroglyphic, early studies, naturally undertaken by classicists, often (but not without exception) emphasized the Greek features of the genre, and assumed that Egyptian elements were, at most, an attempt to give the text the required exotic character.[66] However, a series of studies proceeding from Egyptological parallels, which stress the self-revelations' evident affinities in substance with a wide variety of Egyptian ritual texts, including the kinds of dramatic or quasi-dramatic texts we have already examined, have made it increasingly likely that the Greek self-revelations should be seen as adaptations of essentially Egyptian models.[67] This is true of form as well as content: statements of divine identity (beginning with the Egyptian first-person singular independent pronoun *ỉnk*) have a long history in Egyptian religious literature, appearing already in the Coffin Texts.[68] More broadly, the hymnic genre of litanies is likewise characterized by repeated, anaphoric formulations that introduce each strophe.[69]

A Nineteenth-Dynasty example that is particularly close to the Greek self-revelations in its use of a series of statements beginning with an anaphoric first-person-singular pronoun *ỉnk* is to be found at the entrance of the Osiris chapel in the funerary temple of Seti I at Abydos:[70]

---

same or similar material, see Grandjean, *nouvelle arétologie*; Žabkar, *Hymns*, esp. 159–160.

[65] An excellent survey of the relevant bibliography may be found in Dousa, "Imagining Isis," 151–152, n. 9.

[66] Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 320.

[67] Dousa, "Imagining Isis;" Quack, "Ich bin Isis;" Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites* 274, n. 273.

[68] See Assmann, *LdÄ*, 1: 425–434, s.v. "Aretalogien." Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 332 ff.

[69] See Burkard, *Spätzeitliche Osiris-Liturgien*, 32; Assmann, *LdÄ*, 3:1062–1066, s.v. "Litanei."

[70] My translation, from the text given in Münster, *Göttin Isis*, 193.

Words spoken by Isis:

I am awake, I am awake (*ỉw[= ỉ] rs.kwỉ*)!
I (*ỉnk*) am Isis;
I (*ỉnk*) am the fiery one;
I am awake!
I (*ỉnk*) am the mother of Horus;
I (*ỉnk*) am the sister of the god;
I (*ỉnk*) am the *ḥmmy.t*; [71]
I (*ỉnk*) am the great maiden;
I have come (*ỉỉ.n=ỉ*)–oh father, hear!–
Having fought (*ỉw ỉr ḥɜ.n=ỉ*) in the river of the Two Lands,
To overthrow all of your enemies.
Behold, I (*mk wỉ*) am at your side as the Great Kite;
I (*ỉnk*) am the beloved of your heart.

The Greek revelations and their presumed Egyptian prototypes may well have been used in a similar way, with a priestess or acolyte assuming the role of Isis to proclaim the greatness of the goddess.[72] Although this has been doubted[73] and may be impossible to prove, parallel cases of ritualists taking on the persona of Isis and speaking in her name in the context of magical praxis make the supposition at least plausible. In this context, both narrative *historiolae* like *Isis, the Rich Woman, and the Marsh Woman* as well as non-narrative (i.e., at the macro-level) discourses by Isis may appear side by side, as in this example that appears in both the Nineteenth Dynasty and in the early Ptolemaic period:[74]

Another spell. Recitation.
I am Isis (*ỉnk ʾIs.t*), mistress of Chemmis;
She who is effective of words in the Secret Place.
My father Geb created his magical power for me,
In order to make protection for my son Horus,
In order to seal shut the mouth of every snake;

[71] See Münster, *Göttin Isis* 193, n. 2051, quoting Wb. III, 95, 13: *ḥmmy*, "name of a magical being;" Münster also quotes instances of a word *ḥmm.t* referring to Nut in a funerary context.

[72] Merkelbach, *Isis Regina*, 114; Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 364–365; Schulz, "Warum Isis," 267; cf. Beck, "Mystery Religions," 134–136 on sacred performances in the course of mystery initiations.

[73] See Gordon, review of *Isis Regina*, 234.

[74] Socle Behague, Spell V; in Klasens, *Magical Statue Base*, 35–37 (synoptic text, including P Leiden 1993 and P Chester-Beatty 11), 58–59 (translation), 98–99 (commentary).

> In order to chase away for him every lion in the wilderness,
> Every crocodile in the river.
> As for all 'mouthy ones' (i.e., snakes) who bite with their mouths,
> I am repelling their poison in its moment…

Although this text lacks the emphatically-repeated 'I am…' statements of the Abydos text just quoted and of the Greek self-revelations, the opening "I am Isis" and the retrospective exposition of her mythological role and magical power—though without taking the step into more fully developed, sequential or plotted narrative—invite comparison to the Greek self-revelations both in form and content. And here, the text's appearance with collections of other magical spells, some of which include other kinds of first-person narration by Isis (the New Kingdom exemplars, P Leiden 1993 and P Chester-Beatty XI both also include the tale *Isis and the Secret Name of Re* and the Ptolemaic 'Socle Behague' includes the tale of *Isis, the Rich Woman and the Marsh Girl* which likewise begins with an anaphoric *ỉnk Ỉs.t*) both blurrs the distinction between narrative and non-narrative texts as well as making the self-revelation's ritual *Sitz im Leben*, and its probably use in a quasi-dramatic ritual involving impersonation of Isis, highly plausible.

What is certain is that the Greek self-revelations are replete with instances of minimal narrative—that is, individual statements that purport to represent some action in the past, framed as direct speech of the goddess. Specific historical claims that Isis makes about herself in the Kyme text include the discovery of writing along with, or with the help of, Hermes (Thoth);[75] the discovery of grain;[76] the division of the heaven and earth;[77] and the determination of the paths of heavenly bodies.[78] How far such claims may represent mythological fabulae developed more extensively elsewhere may never be known in every case; but the claim to have "put a stop to cannibalism" (along with, or with the help of, her brother Osiris)[79] certainly suggests a story crying out to be told, one perhaps also alluded to in the Middle Kingdom *Birth and Apotheosis of Horus*, in which Isis identifies Osiris as the

[75] Kyme 3c; the not-unambiguous formulation is "*grámmata heûron metà Hermoû*" which seems intended to claim for Isis a role in the discovery of writing essentially equal to Thoth's; the preposition *metá* plus a personal name in the genitive case can mean 'in common, along with, by aid of, in one's dealings with' (LSJ 1108b–1109a).

[76] Kyme 7.

[77] Kyme 12.

[78] Kyme 13.

[79] Kyme 21.

one who "ended the slaughter (in) the Two Lands" (*wp s˓.t [m] Tȝ.wy*)[80] and, conversely, perhaps also in *The Ritual of Overthrowing Seth*, in which Isis charges Seth with "having instigated slaughter against people in Busiris" (*ỉw ỉr.n=f s˓.t r rmt.w m Ḏdw*);[81] and cf. again P London-Leiden Magical rt. 20.1 ff., which refers to cannibals said to be in Syria, and from whom Isis rescues Anubis. And of course the incipiently-narrative self-affirmations of Isis' identity as "wife and sister of King Osiris"[82] or as "mother of King Horus"[83] nevertheless unleash a flood of associations, many of which are developed in Egyptian ritual or mythological texts or in *interpretationes graecae* like that of Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris* or in Greek-language Isis hymns like the hymns of Isidoros[84] or the Isis hymn of P Oxy. XI 1380.[85]

Where self-revelations differ most noticeably from most other quasi-dramatic ritual texts is at the macro-level: unlike, e.g., the mourning over Osiris that is the subject of the *Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys* and its parallels, divine self-revelation as an event is not an element of any single, specific mythological fabula. Instead, insofar as the Greek and Latin self-revelations have a narrative setting, it is in the context of an irruption of divinity into the present world—paradigmatically in the case of Isis' self-presentations in *The Golden Ass*. The undeniable facts that an appearance of, and speech by, Isis must be conceived of as having taken place prior to being memorialized in a text, and as having unfolded in time, suffice to define the text-type of self-revelation as 'narrative' in those senses in which any drama may be considered narrative. But like the fabulae of texts like the *Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys* and its parallels, the primary fabula of the self-revelations is minimal indeed, consisting of nothing other than Isis' epiphany and subsequent discourse.

[80] CT II, 211c; so also J. Quack, "Ich bin Isis", 349, with further references at n. 121.
[81] P Louvre 3129 C.4–5 = Urk. 6.1, 23.5.
[82] Kyme 6.
[83] Kyme 8.
[84] Vanderlip, *Four Greek Hymns*.
[85] Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XI* 190–220; see Dousa, "Imagining Isis."

Ihweret as Isis-like Figure

At this point, we are in a position to appreciate the extent to which themes and images in *First Setne* resonate with narratives that concern Isis, in the tales that Isis herself tells, in the implied narrative settings and embedded language narratives of the ritual texts in which she figures, and in her direct speech as a character in these rituals. Apart from the Isis-as-narrator theme, sixteen further themes or motifs with at least approximate analogs in *First Setne* present themselves: 1) Isis and Osiris as brother and sister. 2) Osiris young and beautiful. 3) Osiris dies an untimely death. 4) Osiris drowned. 5) Osiris identified with the Nile. 6) Bull and cow imagery. 7) Love and sexual desire. 8) Isis active, Osiris passive. 9) Search for Osiris. 10) Mourning for Osiris. 11) Physical protection of the corpse of Osiris. 12) Isis as instrument of justice or vengeance. 13) Isis physically transformed. 14) Isis as seductress. 15) Maternal imagery/protection of Horus. 16) Demand for justice before a divine court.

1–2. *Isis and Osiris as brother and sister; Osiris young and beautiful*

The most immediate and obvious parallel between Ihweret and Isis is that each is both sister and young bride to her royal husband. While Isis' youth is not, to my knowledge, thematized in texts on Isis and Osiris, it is especially common in the texts of the lamentation genre to stress the youth and beauty of Osiris.[86] A characteristic example, from the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys* ls. 3.7–8 (duet of Isis and Nephthys; my translation):

> Come, sistrum-player, shining of face,
> The unique youth, beautiful when one seems him!

And then 10–12 (likewise Isis and Nephthys):

> Divine youth, beyond all beauty,
> Would that we might see you in your former shape!

As Quack has pointed out, the Egyptian origin of Plutarch's report that Osiris had either reigned as earthly king for twenty-eight years, or else (according to others) had lived a total of twenty-eight years,[87] can now be confirmed in the (probably Ptolemaic) P MMA 35.9.21 13.14–15,

[86] Cf. the remarks of Coenen, "New Stanzas," 18, n. b to l. 17.
[87] Chapt. 42; Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, 184–185 (text and translation).

where a numeral read by Goyon as 107 is to be correctly understood as a Demotic writing of the numeral 28. The relevant passage is to be translated as: "Where are you, oh man of twenty-eight years, of the nomes' searching?"[88]

Although we do not learn in the preserved text of *First Setne* specifically how old Naneferkaptah and Ihweret are when they fall in love and marry, general cultural considerations should probably lead us to imagine them in the first blush of youth. The *Instructions of ʿOnchsheshonqy* recommends that a young man marry at the age of twenty;[89] such evidence as exists suggests that brides were typically younger, in their mid- to late teens.[90] Likewise, there is no definite way to know how long after the marriage we should imagine Naneferkaptah's quest for the Magic Book of Thoth. However, the story seems to suggest that Merib was born in the first year of the couple's marriage, and Merib's minimal role in the story (as well as the way in which the story draws a parallel between him and Isis' son Horus-the-Child/Harpokrates; see further below) might be taken to imply that he is still quite young when the expedition takes place, though he appears to be at least old enough to walk.[91] An age for Naneferkaptah in the mid- to late twenties—thus

[88] Goyon, *Papyrus d'Imouthès* 42, with n. 82; cf. Quack, "Der pränatale Geschlechtsverkehr von Isis und Osiris," 331. Goyon's somewhat free translation of *n ḥḥ n nꜣ spꜣ.wt* as "de la recherche que mènent les nomes," requires taking *ḥḥ* as an infinitive, and each *n* in this expression is the genitive particle; Quack translates similarly, noting Spiegelberg's discussion of Demotic *n* plus infinitive at *demotische Grammatik*, §224β. This usage, however, does not really convey the passive sense of the passage as strongly as one might expect. It may be that the phrase as it appears in the present text represents an attempt to 'modernize' an underlying Middle Egyptian **m ḥḥ n=f m spꜣ.wt*, in which the initial *m* is the *m* of predication and *ḥḥ* is a substantivized passive participle, used in an 'extended' construction (Gardiner, *EG*, §376). The original phrase would then have meant "namely, he who is searched for in the nomes."

[89] 11.7; Glanville, *ʿOnchsheshonqy*, 28–29, with n. 141.

[90] Pestman, *Marriage*, 3–5.

[91] See 4.8–9; Griffith, *Stories*, 26; 108–109; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3: 131; Ritner, trans., "Setna I", 460, in which Merib has "come" (*ỉw*) out on the deck of the expedition's boat and fallen into the river. A difficult passage (*First Setne* 3.8) has been interpreted by Ritner to suggest that Merib was at least old enough to have already receives some sort of instruction in reading and writing: *tỉ=w sḫ=f n sꜥ.t n(?) pr-ʿnḫ*, where Ritner translates: "He was taught to write letters in the House of Life" ("Setna I," 455, with n. 5). If so, perhaps it could be conjectured that Merib should have been at least six or seven years old at the time of the expedition. Griffith, on the other hand, assumed a passive meaning for *sḫ=f* here, and understood: "He was caused to be written in the record in (of?) The House of Life" (so also Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:128); see Griffith, *Stories*, 87–88; also n. 6 on p. 87, for a passive *sḏm=f*

reasonably close to the traditional age of twenty-eight for Osiris at his death—would seem a plausible interpretation of the (admittedly vague) time-line suggested in *First Setne* for the events in Ihweret's tale.

3–5. *Osiris dies untimely death; Osiris drowned; Osiris identified with Nile*

Aside from—but related to—the (presumed) fact of his youth, Naneferkaptah is also marked as an Osirian character through the fact of his untimely death, and through the specific fact that his death comes through drowning, and then the fact that his body is eventually found in the Nile. Compositions of the lamentations genre are full of allusions to these features of the Osiris myth. From the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys*, on Osiris' untimely death:

> (1.14–15) Oh, fair youth, who departed at the wrong time; young man, whose time it was not! (Here duet of Isis and Nephthys)

And on the drowning of Osiris, here first from the Twenty-Fifth-Dynasty *Memphite Theology* l. 62:

> For Osiris is drowned in his water, while Isis and Nephthys looked at him and saw him, and were astounded (?) over him. Horus commanded without delay that they seize Osiris and protect him, he having drowned.

And from the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys*:

> (6.2, similarly 14.28): *Iha'y*![92] You are protected, you who were drowned in the nome of Aphroditopolis!

Of course this method of death leads to Osiris' identification with the Nile itself.[93]

---

after *tȝ*; cf. also Spiegelberg, *Demotische Grammatik*, 59, §114. The difficulty with Ritner's understanding is that if *sḫ=f* is taken actively, the sentence says literally "he was caused to write in/with a document in the House of Life"–the clear *n* before *sʿ.t* would not be expected before the direct object of a finite verb. For the meaning assumed by Ritner, one might rather expect some such formulation as **tȝ=w rḫ=f sḫ-sʿ.t n pr-ʿnḫ*, "he was caused to know the script of documents (i.e., Demotic) in the House of Life."

[92] A vocative interjection more often approximated in English with the archaizing "Oho!"

[93] See Burkard, *Osiris-Liturgien*,28 (*Ỉrỉ-ỉrỉ* papyrus, × + 2.13–14); 29 (*Ỉrỉ-ỉrỉ* × + 2.23–24); *Glorification of Osiris* 2.16ff.; *Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys* (P Berlin 3008), 5.1ff.

6–7. *Love and sexual desire; bull and cow imagery*

According to Plutarch, Isis and Osiris had fallen in love and even experienced one another sexually in the womb of their mother Nut;[94] recently, Quack has plausibly argued that this story has Egyptian roots.[95] While *First Setne* obviously suggests no such thing about Ihweret and Naneferkaptah, a strong sexual and romantic attraction between young siblings is central to the beginning of the tale of Naneferkaptah.

The love between Isis and Osiris is often expressed in terms of bull and cow imagery, especially passages from texts of the lamentations genre. From the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys* ls. 5.24–6.1 (solo speech of Isis):

> Oh, great bull, lord of sexual pleasure,
> Burden (?)[96] your sister Isis;
> Then remove the pain in her limbs;
> So that she can embrace you, without you being far from her;
> Place life upon the forehead of the cow (*wšb*[*.t*])!

Other characteristic epithets of Osiris from the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys* include 'bull of the two sisters' (*kꜣ n sn.ty* 2.6) and 'the bull who ejaculates within cows' (*pꜣ kꜣ sty m k.wt* 3.6).

It seems possible that the specific names 'Ihweret' and 'Naneferkaptah' are intended to resonate with this imagery and these associations. The name 'Naneferkaptah' is apparently attested only in *First Setne* and in two other Setne texts: CGC 30692 and in the unpublished Setne text from the Tebtynis temple library.[97] In the *Demotisches Namenbuch*, the name is translated "Schön ist der Ka des Ptah"–that is, the *kꜣ*-element is interpreted as the word for 'soul' or 'life-force.' However, this word

---

[94] *Isis and Osiris* chapt. 12; Griffiths, *de Iside et Osiride*, 136–137.

[95] Quack, "Der pränatale Geschlechtsverkehr von Isis und Osiris," 328–330.

[96] The word is spelled *ꜣpd*, with bird determinative, and is evidently a hapax in this orthography. It is defined as "begatten" at *Wb.* I, 9, 11; Faulkner translates "lie with." The writing suggests a metaphorical connection with birds, but the exact nature of the metaphor is not immediately apparent. To 'bird' someone may well be plausible as a term for sexual intercourse; if this word is connected to *ꜣpd* 'hurry, rush' (Wilson, *Ptolemaic Lexikon*, 7), then perhaps the specific connotation is along the lines of 'ravish' or 'take violently.' An alternative, which I tentatively propose here, is that this *ꜣpd* might be a by-form of *ꜣtp* 'to load; to burden' (*Wb.* I, 23,15–24,3); compare ⲱⲃⲧ, ⲟⲡⲧ-, ⲟⲡⲧ, Bohairic by-forms of ⲱⲧⲡ 'to load' (Crum, *CD* 532a), which are similar or identical in their orthography to Bohairic ⲱⲃⲧ 'goose' (Crum, *CD* 518b). If so, then the bird-determinative will have been an orthographic error motivated by phonetic confusion, and the expression might refer to the weight of Osiris as he lies on top of Isis during love-making.

[97] *DNB* 619, citing only *First Setne*; the name also appears in CGC 30692, 1. For the Tebtynis text, see again Ryholt, n. 16 *supra*.

appears to have been largely obsolete in Demotic, and in *First Setne*, the writing of the element *kꜣ* is graphically identical to the common writing of the word *kꜣ* 'bull'. While it may well have been the case that knowledgeable readers of the tale understood that the name was constructed on an earlier pattern in which the old word for 'soul' was evoked, still the actual orthography of the word in *First Setne* would inevitably have created associations with the common word *kꜣ* 'bull.' Accordingly, Erichsen in the *Demotisches Glossar* quotes the name under his entry for *kꜣ* 'bull'[98] and Griffith likewise translated the name "Beautiful is the bull of Ptah."[99] Although I have been unable to locate any other instance of the phrase 'bull of Ptah,' I would presume that Griffith's conjecture of a connection to Apis is in all likelihood correct. Apis, in turn, is linked not only to Ptah (of whom he is most often referred to as the *wḥm*, 'herald' or 'avatar'),[100] but also to Osiris, most especially in the syncretic forms Apis-Osiris, Osiris-Apis or Sarapis. Like Naneferkaptah, the Apis bull was buried in Memphis[101]–as was, according to the tradition preserved both in Plutarch and in the *Memphite Theology*, Osiris himself.[102]

Like the name 'Naneferkaptah,' the personal name 'Ihweret' is all but unattested outside of *First Setne*–aside from our Ihweret, the *Demotisches Namenbuch* quotes only one other example,[103] and the name does not appear at all in Ranke, *Personennamen*. The name was left untranslated by both Griffith and the *Namenbuch*; but it is more than tempting to connect the initial element *Ỉh-*, spelled with the reed-leaf and the first *h*, with Ihet, a manifestation of the Celestial Cow who appears frequently as Ihet-weret.[104] It would certainly not be unexpected to find an Isis-

[98] Erichsen, *DG*, 556.

[99] Griffith, *Stories*, 16, n. 1; Griffith does note that this is probably a reinterpretation of an earlier name pattern in which the element *kꜣ* means 'double,' 'life-force.' And, in fact, the writings of the name Naneferkaptah in the Setne texts CGC 30692 and in the unpublished Setne text from the Tebtynis temple library spell the name with the more historically-correct *kꜣ*-arms 𓂝, not the Demotic *kꜣ*-bull group. Even in these cases, however, it may be at least possible that the meaning of 'bull' is intended; cf. the remarks of Burkard, *Osiris-Liturgien* 24, n. 16 to the *Ỉrỉ-ỉrỉ* papyrus, × + 1.12, citing *Wb*. 5, 94.

[100] See Holmberg, *The God Ptah*, 196–198.

[101] See in general Kessler, *Die heiligen Tiere*, 57–104.

[102] *Memphite Theology*, 20b–22; Sethe, *Dramatische Texte*, 40–41, with n. d) on p. 41; *Memphite Theology*, 63–64, *Dramatische Texte*, 73–77, with n. c) on p. 74; Lichtheim, ed. and trans. *AEL* 1: 53–56. On the Late-Period date of Memphite Theology, see Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL* 3: 5 and literature cited there.

[103] *DNB* 1.2,74, non-literary.

[104] For Ihet, see Leitz, *Lexikon* 1: 537a–538b; on Ihet-weret, 538b–539b. On the Celestial Cow(s) generally, see Hornung, *Himmelskuh*, 96ff.

like character with a name suggestive of cow-theology. Largely because of her close connection with Hathor, Isis begins to take on cow-like attributes as early as the Middle Kingdom, when she first appears with cow horns in a determinative in one version of Spell 49 of the Coffin Texts.[105] Literary references to Isis in cow-form become common from the New Kingdom forward, but Isis is not actually pictured as fully cow-headed or indeed completely in cow-form until the Late Period, at which point this visual imagery becomes common.[106]

While direct equations between Isis and Ihet are rare—none are recorded in Leitz, *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen*–neither are they entirely absent. One example appears in some Ptolemaic versions of Chapter 142 of the Book of the Dead, which include a passage that identifies Isis with a number of other goddesses, including Neith, Selqet, Maʿat and Ihet.[107] For our purposes, a more telling example appears in column 15.1 of the *Songs of Isis and Nephthys*. Here, Ihet (spelled *ꜣhꜣ[.tj]*) and the sky-goddess Nut are presented in the context of a first-person discourse by Isis as mourners for Osiris; the goddesses appear to be metonymic references to Isis herself. And the equation can go the other way as well, especially in the Graeco-Roman period, when 'Isis' appears as an impersonal term for heaven.[108]

But if the specific equation Isis = Ihet is uncommon, Ihet can nevertheless be freely identified directly with Hathor, less often with Neith, each of whom appears both in association and assimilation with Isis at all times, but especially prominently in the Graeco-Roman period, both in Egyptian sources[109] and in *interpretationes Graecae*.[110] Isis and Hathor, moreover, are closely connected to the Apis bull. Isis is often identified as the mother of the living Apis,[111] who—explicitly so in the Ptolemaic period—could be identified with the ruling monarch.[112]

---

[105] CT I 215b; Münster, *Göttin Isis*, 119, n. 1310.

[106] Münster, *Göttin Isis*, 202.

[107] See 142 §S, Var. 4; Allen, *The Book of the Dead*, 120.

[108] Kurth, "*ꜣsṯ* (Isis): Eine Bezeichnung des Himmels."

[109] Leitz, *Lexikon*, 1:538b–539a.

[110] On Isis as both Hathor and Methyer, or *Mḥ.t-wr.t*, an alternative Celestial Cow, see Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, Chapt. 56 (206–207 for text and translation, comments on 512). On Isis as Neith, see *De Iside et Osiride*, Chapt. 9 (Griffiths, 130–131 for text and translation, with useful comments on 283–284).

[111] Smith, "Death and Life," 217; also P Vienna D6920–6922 ×+2.5–6, in Hoffmann, "Der literarische demotische Papyrus Wien D6920–6922," 173–174; Kessler, *Die heiligen Tiere*, 62; 96–97.

[112] Kessler, *Die heiligen Tiere* 80; Assmann, *Mind of Egypt*, 375.

But it is evident in the Ptolemaic stelas dedicated to Isis the mother of Apis in the Memphite Sarapaeum, that in this context Osiris-Apis is viewed as Isis' consort, and is distinct from the living Apis of whom Isis was the mother.[113] This is consonant with those Greek-language sources that make Sarapis assume the position of Osiris in the Isis-Sarapis-Harpokrates triad.[114] Even if it is correct to see in Naneferkaptah's name a reference to the Apis bull, nevertheless Naneferkaptah—being dead, and inhabiting the (or an) Underworld—is more likely to resonate with Osiris-Apis/Sarapis than the living Apis.[115]

It is worth noting, however, that, despite the frequent and strong sexual connotations of the bull- and cow-imagery in the texts that deal with the Isis and Osiris myth, *First Setne* largely avoids dwelling on the erotic aspects of the relationship between Naneferkaptah and Ihweret, pointing out only that at the very beginning of their marriage:

> He (scil., Naneferkaptah) slept with me on that very night; he found me [very pleasing; he slept] with me over and over again, and each of us loved the other.[116]

The story goes on to imply that Ihweret became pregnant almost immediately, and from now on there is no overt statement about the sexual aspect of Ihweret's relationship with Naneferkaptah. This reticence may be for reasons intrinsic to the structure of story itself: the strongly sexual relationship between Setne and Tabubue is placed in contrast to the relationship of Ihweret and Naneferkaptah, in which the feminine roles of sister and mother are fore-fronted. While Ihet can certainly be identified with Hathor, Ihet is nowhere (to my knowledge) directly connected with explicit sexual imagery in the way Hathor and Isis often are. It may be that Ihweret is identified in the story with Ihet-weret, whose epithets often stress her role as mother of the sun-god Re,[117] precisely so as to present her Isis-ness in a way that avoids drawing attention to her sexuality and instead emphasizes her maternal

---

[113] See in general Smith, "Death and Life."

[114] Merkelbach, *Isis Regina*, 71–86 (on Osiris and Sarapis); 87–93 (on Harpokrates).

[115] On the parameters of the problem, see in general Stambaugh, *Sarapis*; Kessler, *Die heiligen Tiere*, 65–88; Assmann, *Mind of Egypt*, 374–375.

[116] *First Setne* 3.6–7. For the restoration "very pleasing" (as Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 455, though without comment), note that the statement is framed emphatically: *ỉỉr=f gm.ṯ=y* […], which suggests the need for some adverbial expression in the lacuna; *m-šs*, 'very, exceedingly' would fit the sense.

[117] See Hornung, *Himmelskuh*, 97.

aspects.[118] At the same time, the name pleasingly complements the bovine connotations of the name 'Naneferkaptah,' and complements in an interesting way the name of the other major character in the tale, Tabubue, as we will see presently.

8–11. *Isis active, Osiris passive; search for Osiris; mourning for Osiris; physical protection of the corpse of Osiris*

Although Naneferkaptah is by no means entirely passive in the main narration—he appears outside of his tomb to interact with Setne, and in fact seems to have arranged everything that happens in the framing story—nevertheless Ihweret's active role in the tale is unusual and bears comparison with Isis' conspicuously active role in the Isis-Osiris myth. In texts of the lamentations genre, it is Isis who is the active urger of sexual union—necessarily so, since Osiris is dead.[119] And before this union can take place, it is Isis who must take the initiative to search (with the help of her sister Nephthys) the land for the fragments of Osiris' corpse, a search especially nicely expressed in a speech by Nephthys in the early Ptolemaic P MMA 35.9.21, 11.13:[120]

> I have crossed the flood; and I have penetrated as far as the sky for my brother! My heart cries for him; my eyes weep for him! Oh, my powerful one (*wsr*, punning on *Wsỉr* Osiris);[121] I spend the days searching for you; I spend the nights longing for you! Where are you? ⟨Are you yet⟩ alive?

With the body of Osiris found, Isis must then reassemble his members, and then—most importantly—rouse Osiris from his slumber with the promise of renewed sexual vigor. We have already considered one relevant passage from the *Glorification Ritual for Osiris*:

> I am Isis; there is no god or goddess who has done what I have done: Even though I am a woman, I acted (the part of a) male, from the desire to make your name live upon the earth.

Similarly, the Maronea Isis hymn is also explicit in making Isis the active sexual partner at l. 17, where it is said to Isis that "you chose

---

[118] On this aspect of the cow-image, see in general, J. Berlandini, "La déesse bucéphale."

[119] On the passivity of Osiris, see Sternberg, *Mythische Motive*, 216 with n. 1.

[120] Goyon, *Papyrus d'Imouthès*, 39.

[121] Cf. Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, Chapt. 37, in which Plutarch reports a tradition that explains the name of Osiris as "Mighty;" Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, 176–177 (text and translation); 442 (comment).

Sarapis as your companion (*súnoikos*)." Isis' active sexual role may be compared specifically to Ihweret's remarkably active role in arranging her marriage to Naneferkaptah. Although we learn nothing in the preserved text of the couple's courtship, we do see that it is Ihweret who appears to convince the pharaoh to approve the marriage—first approaching him through intermediaries (as Setne does in his attempt to seduce Tabubue), then finally cajoling him in person. Naneferkaptah has no visible role in these events at all. Furthermore, in *First Setne*, Ihweret's physical location by the mummy of Naneferkaptah, narrating the sad events that led to his death, inevitably recall Isis' role as mourner by the bier of Osiris. And Ihweret's specific purpose in telling the story—to dissuade Setne from stealing the Magic Book from Naneferkaptah's tomb—resonates as well with Isis' role as defender of the body of Osiris.

One other detail within Ihweret's narration also resonates with Isis' search for Osiris, and her distress at being unable to locate him. When Naneferkaptah returns to Koptos with the Magic Book, Ihweret describes herself (3.39) as

> [sitting] above the sea of Koptos, not having eaten or drunk, without having done anything at all, having the appearance of a person who has reached the Good House (i.e., an embalming chapel).[122]

Ihweret's description of her distress at her separation from Naneferkaptah, and of her state at his return, bears comparison to many of Isis' descriptions of herself and her devastation at the loss of Osiris. See, e.g., *Songs* 6.32–37 (Faulkner's translation):[123]

> Darkness is here for us in my sight even while Rē is in the sky;
> the sky is merged in the earth and a shadow is made in the earth to-day.
> My heart is hot at thy wrongful separation;
> My heart is hot (because) thou hast turned thy back to me;
> for there was never a fault which thou didst find in me.
> The two Regions are upheaved, the roads are confused…

The darkness stressed here, the merger of sky and earth, and the upheaval of Egypt, are all suggestive of cosmic catastrophe worse by far than Ihweret's feeling of the approach of death; but these passages are

[122] Griffith, *Stories*, 25; 104–105; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3: 130; Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 458–459.
[123] Faulkner, "Bremner-Rhind Papyrus—I," 126.

not dissimilar in the way in which each frames the sister's distress at the loss of her brother/spouse in terms of a (potential) end to existence.[124]

12–14. *Isis as instrument of justice or vengeance; Isis physically transformed; Isis as seductress*

A specific and special aspect of Isis' role as the 'active' partner in the Osiris-Isis duo, and as defender of her husband/brother and her son, is Isis' role in assuring the punishment and destruction of Seth and his confederates, the enemies of Osiris and of Horus. This is only the most specific manifestation of Isis' identity as Isis-Maʿat,[125] a conception that appears in Greek Isis theology in the titles Isis-*Dikaiosúne* ('Isis-Justice') and—more threateningly—Isis-*Némesis*. While this latter constellation has been considered to be a purely Greek formulation,[126] in fact Isis' cosmic role in helping to ensure the destruction of Seth,[127] and her this-worldly role in bringing low the arrogant and impious,[128] suggests that this, too, is an Egyptian conception. One particularly vivid description of Isis' role as punisher of evil and defender of Osiris comes in the *Ritual for the Destruction of Enemies* in which Osiris describes in direct speech the invincibility of Isis:

> My sister Isis is behind me, behind me; she prevented [for me?] that they carry me away on this beautiful day, on which I have appeared in the nomes. [As for those among them, who] [hurried] to heaven as birds, my sister Isis raged against them with the bird-net, and [she has removed their] places […] my enemies. She wrapped their arms and [their feet] with white fabric (?). She cut short [their hearts through a cutting short; she cut away] their arms and their legs … she laid snares against them with the (?) bird-net. She chopped up their bodies with (?) … on their straw (?). The gods have lifted up what she did for Osiris in *ḥw.t-wṯs* (House of Lifting-Up).[129]

---

[124] Useful discussion of this passage in Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 117–118.

[125] Griffiths, "Isis as Maat, Dikaiosunê and Iustitia."

[126] See Griffiths, *Isis-Book*, 153; *idem*, "Isis as Maat, Dikaiosunê and Iustitia," 262, with n. 47.

[127] Note that Seth's outright destruction and exclusion from the community of the gods is a phenomenon of the Late Period; pharaonic material tends to stress the eventual reconciliation (*ḥtp*) of Horus and Seth; cf. Assmann, *Mind of Egypt*, 41–42; 200; 389 ff.

[128] See again the tale of "Isis, the Rich Woman, and the Marsh Woman;" and cf. the remarks of Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 353–354. As Schulz points out, the impious dead also had reason to fear Isis' punishing aspect; see "Warum Isis," 255 with n. 35.

[129] *Ỉrỉ-ỉrỉ* papyrus, ×+5.11–15. The translation here follows Burkard, *Osiris-Liturgien*, 65–66.

A similarly vengeful Isis speaks for herself in the *Triumph of Horus at Edfu* (in a direct address to Horus, urging him to attack the Seth-hippopotamus with a harpoon; Fairman's translation):

> I, yea, I am the lady of the shaft.
> I am the beautiful one, the mistress of the loud-screamer,
> When it comes forth upon the banks
> And gleams after the robber-beast,
> Which rips open his skin,
> And breaks open his ribs
> When the barbs enter his belly.
> I forget not the night of the flood,
> The hour of turmoil.[130]

In the course of her combat against Seth, Isis is seen more than once to physically transform herself, and to use trickery, including sexual entrapment, to thwart Seth's designs. To the extent that Ihweret is an Isis-like figure, then this raises the possibility that—as others have conjectured—Tabubue is nothing other than a manifestation of Ihweret. It is worth noting the parallelism between Setne's encounters with Naneferkaptah and with Tabubue. In Naneferkaptah's tomb, Setne plays a board game with Naneferkaptah for possession of the magic book.[131] In the course of the competition, Naneferkaptah strikes Setne on the head three times with the game board, causing him to sink further into the ground each time—first to his ankles, then to his phallus, and finally up to his ears. In Tabubue's encounter with Setne, she likewise makes three successive demands on her victim, each of which mires him further psychologically. A natural interpretation of this parallelism may be that now, Ihweret has taken on Setne in a game of her own. Tabubue's presence outside of the tomb is no obstacle to this conclusion: Naneferkaptah is also able to materialize outside the tomb and interact incognito with Setne.

The best known of Isis' literary transformations are, perhaps, in the Ramesside *Contendings of Horus and Seth*. In the first of these, Isis appears as an old woman to convince the ferryman Nemty to transport her to the Island in the Midst so that she can interpose herself into the deliber-

---

[130] Blackman and Fairman, "Myth of Horus at Edfu—II" (part 3), 9; Fairman, *Triumph of Horus*, 104 (Act II.i.85 ff.); text in Chassinat, *Edfou*, 6:81.4–6.

[131] *First Setne*, 4.28 ff.; Griffith, *Stories*, 116–117; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:132–133; Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 462.

ations of the Ennead.[132] She next appears as a young girl "beautiful in all of her members", in which form she hopes to trick the sexually-voracious Seth into damning himself with his own words.[133] Just as Isis in *Contendings* is able to use her sexual power against Seth, so too does Tabubue force Setne to confront his own culpability. Tabubue's near-nudity in this episode may also be compared with the numerous Graeco-Roman representations of Isis/Hathor in which the goddess has raised her dress to expose her vulva,[134] or in fact appears entirely naked.[135] The same image of the raised dress recalls Herodotus' description in 2.60 of women exposing their own genitals while traveling to the annual festival of Bastet at Bubastis, which then returns us to *First Setne*'s specification that Tabubue is a daughter of a priest of Bastet. An even closer parallel to Tabubue's costume as described in the tale would be statues of Ptolemaic queens, identified with Isis/Hathor, which render their subjects in very revealing garments, sometimes all but invisible.[136]

Isis' transformations can, however, be more threatening, just as Tabubue's initial sexual appeal becomes a deadly trap for Setne. In the Ptolemaic P Jumilhac, Isis undergoes three transformations that are connected with violent confrontation with Seth and his allies. In 2.22–2.24 and at 21.23–25, Isis transforms herself into Sakhmet and produces fire to incinerate the confederates of Seth.[137] In Jumilhac 3.1–3.5, Seth in bull-form attempts to rape Isis, who transforms herself into a dog with a knife attached to the tip of her tail; she escapes and Seth ejaculates on the ground. And in 3.6–11, Isis (here also identified with Hathor) transforms herself into a snake and destroys the confederates of Seth with her poison.[138] Earlier, it had been Hathor who became

---

[132] Horus and Seth 5.6ff.; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 317; Wente, "Contendings of Horus and Seth," 95.

[133] Horus and Seth 6.4ff. Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 2: 317; Wente, "Contendings of Horus and Seth," 96.

[134] On the type, see F. Dunand, *Terres cuites gréco-romaines*, 136–138, cat. nos. 358–363; cf. also *idem*, "pseudo-baubo."

[135] A particularly nice example is the Isis-Hathor statuette Metropolitan Museum of Art 1991.76; cf. also Dunand, *Terres cuites gréco-romaines*, 125–135, cat. nos. 327–358.

[136] For example, the statue Hermitage Museum 3936, variously identified as Arsinoe II or Cleopatra VII; see Walker and Higgs, eds., *Cleopatra of Egypt*, 160. In this statue, the dress is indicated only by a hem-line, a neck-line, and lines at the wrists; breasts, belly and pubic area are strongly emphasized.

[137] Isis is equated with Sakhmet only late in Egyptian religious history; see Hoenes, *Göttin Sachmet*, 191–192; cf. also the Demotic magical text P London Leiden Magical 20.2.

[138] Vandier, *Papyrus Jumilhac*, 114; Sternberg, *Mythische Motive*, 145.

Sakhmet to attack mankind in the pharaonic myth of the *Celestial Cow*[139] and in fact in Jumilhac 21.23–25, there is a triple identification between Isis, Hathor, and Sakhmet. Isis' role as punisher and avenger, then, is no less compatible with her shared identity with Hathor than is her role as a symbol of sexuality. The *femme fatale* Tabubue certainly seems to carry within her character precisely these Isis-Hathoric traits: those of seductress, and those of avenger.

It may be possible to find some corroboration of all of these associations in the name of Tabubue, which has never been satisfactorily interpreted, but which appears to me to be an evocation of precisely those punishing, threatening aspects of Isis-Hathor that we have just discussed. The initial *Ta-* means 'She of …' and is part of a common pattern that typically includes a divine name. The element *Bwbwe* has been most often interpreted as 'The Shining One'.[140] A god by this name is otherwise unknown, however, and in his study of the text, F. Ll. Griffith suggested a connection to Baubo, an old woman who figures in some versions of the Greek myth of Demeter, in which Baubo exposes her vulva to the goddess Demeter to 'cheer her up' after Demeter has lost her daughter Persephone to the underworld god Hades.[141] Recently, R. Jasnow has suggested a connection to the god *Bзby*, who is connected to raucous sexuality, though he acknowledges the orthographic difficulties.[142] The more common approach is to take the *Bwbwe*-element as an epithet; R. Ritner accepts the interpretation of "She of the Shining One," and thinks the reference is to either the goddess Bastet or the goddess Hathor.[143] In favor of the latter of these interpretations, one might compare the numerous epithets of Hathor that involve connections to gold,[144] and Tabubue is indeed said to be wearing a large amount of gold jewelry when Setne first sees her.[145]

---

[139] See Hornung, *Himmelskuh*, 39, l. 58; also n. 39 *ad loc*. on p. 55.

[140] Griffith, *Stories*, 33, n. *ad loc*., and 122, with n. *ad loc*., comparing Coptic **ⲃⲟⲩⲃⲟⲩ** "shine, glitter" (Crum, *CD*, 29a). Cf. also *bwbw* "Glanz" in Erichsen, *DG*, 115, discussed further below.

[141] Griffith, *Stories*, 33, note to l. 3.

[142] Jasnow, "Pharaoh Laughed," 80.

[143] Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 463, n. 27.

[144] Leitz, *Lexikon*, 4:181ff. Cf. also the epithet "Mistress of Illumination" (*nb.t sḫḏ*) which appears in connection with Hathor already in the Coffin Texts; see the Hathor "aretalogy" at CT IV, 177f., quoted in Quack, "Ich bin Isis," 333.

[145] *First Setne* 4.39; Griffith, *Stories*, 121; Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:133; Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 463.

Perhaps more tellingly, however, the rare verb *bwbw* 'to shine' is used of Tefnut in the Demotic *Myth of the Eye of the Sun*, immediately following her transformation from the more pacific 'Ethiopian cat;' the word here is closely connected to images of fire and power.[146] More recently, the word—otherwise unattested in published Demotic literature—has been identified in the second of a pair of ostraca bearing a hymn to a relatively obscure goddess, variously called *Nḥm-ʿny.t* and *ʿy*, a patroness of the *hrw nfr*, the 'good day, festival.' This term can characterize a time spent in feasting and song, and not seldom also drunkenness and love-making—most of which characterizes Setne's *hrw nfr* with Tabubue.[147] The hymn to *ʿy* begins:

> (ls. 1–4) They say, ecstatically: "May she shine (*bwbw=s*)!" (The goddess) *ʿy* will cast them into a state of desire(?),[148] they being beside themselves (?)[149] through (?) (the effect of) her body (?)[150] on the festival day. May it be granted, the appearance of *ʿy*.[151] Let him drink, let him eat, let him copulate in the presence of *Tɜ-ʿy*.

---

[146] P Leiden I 384 12.13–19; the phrase *ỉr=s bwbw*, "she shone, gleamed," occurs in 12.19. Discussion in Depauw and Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy," 76; see also Spiegelberg, *Mythus*, 34–35 and plate 11; de Cenival, *Mythe*, 36–37; 97, note *ad loc*.; plate 11.

[147] Depauw and Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy," 76 with ns. 29 and 30 note the connection to Tabubue but do not explore her meaning in this light.

[148] *s(.t) wḫɜ*: Depauw and Smith translate concretely "place of seeking;" see comment at "Visions of Ecstacy," 88–89.

[149] *ỉw=w wbɜ=w*: apparently literally, "they being in relation to themselves." Erichsen, *DG*, 84–85 does not record a spatial sense of *wbɜ*, but cf. Crum, *CD*, 476a, s.v. ⲟⲩⲃⲉ, where a number of spatial uses, including "along side of," are recorded; this is the basis of my suggested translation here. If this is the correct interpretation of the phrase, the expression would seem to bear comparison with the Greek *ékstasis* 'standing outside of oneself, ecstacy.' Depauw and Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy," 74–75, tentatively translate "they will take care of them."

[150] *(n)-ḏr.ṯ ḥ.ṯ=s*: Depauw and Smith translate "in the hand of her corporation." I wonder if *ḥ.ṯ=s* ought to refer to the body of the goddess (Erichsen, *DG*, 373–374 records a number of writings that lack the flesh determinative, as here; the use of the suffix pronoun is at least consistent with this interpretation); and, if so, if *(n)-ḏr.ṯ* ought to be taken in its instrumental sense of "through, by means of" (Erichsen, *DG*, 644; Crum, *CD*, 428a; Quack, in his review of *Res Severa Verum Gaudium*, 181, suggests similarly *(n)-ḏr.ṯ ⟨=s⟩ ḥ.ʿ=s*, "durch ⟨sie⟩ selbst"). The first ostracon of this pair reports (l. 4) that devotees of *Nḥm-ʿny.t* will see the *mrɜ.t*, evidently a vision of the goddess induced by drink and/or religious frenzy; see "Visions of Ecstasy," 69–70, and 72 n. c. It could be that it is the physical appearance of the goddess *ʿy* that drives her worshipers into their *ékstasis*, just as the sight of Tabubue's body incites Setne to the ultimate crime.

[151] *my tỉ=w s pɜ šm ʿy*: So Depauw and Smith. Quack, review of *Res Severa Verum Gaudium*, 181, suggests here *my tỉ=w n=y ḥḏ*, "möge man mir Silber geben," which is attractive paleographically but difficult to explain semantically in the broader context of the hymn. The following *šm ʿy* would then be an independent optative, "May *ʿy* come forth!"

As Depauw and Smith point out, *Tɜy* here is a Demotic writing of the noun *ti.t*, 'image,' an epithet of divinities like Hathor and Sakhmet, who are daughters of Re, and manifestations of the Eye of the Sun, a quality that has both benign and dangerous aspects:[152]

> Goddesses who are identified with the eye of Re frequently have a double nature, at certain times displaying a dangerous, destructive aspect, and at others, a more benevolent or erotic one. These two aspects are often hypostasized as separate deities, each being given a distinct name, although in reality they are complementary parts of a single divine entity.[153]

Depauw and Smith here describe *Nḥm-ʿny.t* as the benevolent side of the goddess, while *ʿy*, like Sakhmet or Tefnut, is a violent, lion-headed divinity. This complementarity parallels the complementarity of Hathor and Sakhmet in the *Myth of the Celestial Cow* or the ubiquitous complementarity of Bastet and Sakhmet.[154] In both the Demotic *Eye of the Sun* myth and in the Leuven ostracon, it is tempting to interpret the verb *bwbw* 'to shine' as a reflection of Tefnut's and *Nḥm-ʿny.t/ʿy*'s identity as projections of the power of Re. Tabubue's connection to a generalized 'Shining One' and her simultaneously erotic and punishing role in the tale would certainly appear to resonate with these and other fiery Eye-of-the-Sun manifestations like Sakhmet, whose power is closely connected with the image of fire from the late Eighteenth Dynasty onward;[155] or like *ʿy*; or Tefnut in the Demotic tale, or at Philae, where she has among her most important epithets 'mistress of the *nsr.t*-flame' and 'mistress of the *nbi.t*-flame;'[156] or Isis-Sakhmet as she appears in P Jumilhac. It may not be possible to conclude that Tabubue's name refers directly to any specific manifestation of the Eye of the Sun, though the episode's Memphite locale, and the status of Tabubue's father's as a priest of Bastet, might be taken to point to Sakhmet.[157] But the name 'She of the Shining One' expressed with a word that appears in Demotic otherwise only in connection with Eye-

[152] Depauw and Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy," 83–84, with n. 64.
[153] Depauw and Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy," 84.
[154] Hoenes, *Göttin Sachmet*,168–171.
[155] See Hoenes, *Göttin Sachmet*, 70–71.
[156] Inconnu-Bocquillon, *Déesse Lointaine*, 238 ff. Goyon, "Isis-scorpion," 452–454.
[157] Griffith himself suggested that Sakhmet is intended in the reference to Bastet here; see *Stories*, 33, n. to l. 3.

of-the-Sun manifestations, would strongly suggest that she is intended to resonate with this complex of goddesses. That is: despite Setne's own first impression, Tabubue is quickly shown to be fundamentally unlike the transgressive women condemned in Egyptian wisdom texts.[158] Nor is she to be interpreted in a manner similar to entirely-negative female characters like the Ramesside wife of Bata in *The Tale of Two Brothers*, or the lover and mistress of Truth in *The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood*. And if Tabubue is correctly interpreted in relationship with the threatening aspect of Eye-of-the-Sun divinities, then this again underscores her complementarity with Ihweret, whose name evokes the Celestial Cow and the resolution of the conflict between Re and humanity.

It is worth noting, however, that the role of eros in *First Setne* does not precisely fit the model suggested here by Depauw and Smith, in which sexuality is assigned to the 'benign' end of the spectrum of attributes characteristic of Eye-of-the-Sun manifestations. While Ihweret's relationship to Naneferkaptah is of course sexual, the more strongly erotic character in the tale is Tabubue, and—like Isis in *Contendings of Horus and Seth*–it is precisely her sexual power that she uses to bring Setne low. The reason for this may have to do with the tale's comic intent and structure. Though her name may be evocative of Sakhmet and her dangerous sisters, Tabubue's role is not to obliterate Setne, but to persuade him to give up his own selfishness. Therefore the punishment she inflicts is, relatively speaking, light. Sexual escapades are generally characteristic of comedy in all cultures; the lustful magician is an attested motif in Egyptian folklore,[159] and it is interesting to point out that lust

[158] See Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature*, 48–50; 161–162; Troy, "Good and Bad Women."

[159] E.g., the fictionalized Nektanebo II in the Greek *Alexander Romance*, who masquerades as the god Amun in order to seduce Olympias, the future mother of Alexander the Great; convenient English translation by Dowden, "Alexander Romance." On the connection of Egypt's Nektanebo legends with the *Alexander Romance*, see Jasnow, "The Greek Alexander Romance;" Ryholt, "Nectanebo's Dream." Another anecdote of a lustful magician appears in a Christian anti-pagan polemic; see Kugener, "Sévère, Patriarche d'Antioche," 18, which includes an anecdote of an Egyptian magician named Asklepiodotos who goes so far as to have sex with a statue of Isis in order to secure her assistance in conceiving a baby with his barren wife. The precise procedure is not described, but in any case is not efficacious; so Asklepiodotos and his wife secretly adopt the child of an impoverished priestess and present it to their gullible fellow pagans as the fruit of a miraculous intervention by Isis (my thanks to Nicole Hansen for this reference).

for illicit sex and forbidden magical knowledge is precisely what initiates the humiliation of the character Lucius in the 'Ass' tales of Apuleius and (pseudo-) Lucian.[160]

Finally, it may be worth considering the name *Ta-Bwy* (?), which it may be possible to read in *Demotic Chronicle* 3.5.[161] Even if correct, the relationship of the name *Ta-Bwy* (?) to Tabubue is far from certain; but it is at least interesting to observe that in the *Demotic Chronicle*, this *Ta-Bwy* (?) is equated with the uraeus, the protective cobra that Pharaoh wears on his brow, and which is another manifestation of the Eye of Re.[162]

15. *Maternal imagery*

If *First Setne* could be said to have a narrative or aesthetic flaw, it might be the character of Merib, the son of Ihweret and Naneferkaptah. As a character, he is completely colorless, and—so one might think—could have been eliminated from the tale with little loss. But this is not quite correct. Merib's importance in the tale has nothing to do with anything that he does, which is little more than die. This death may add to the pathos of the story as a whole, but Merib's real function is to confer on Ihweret the status of motherhood, and thus complete the expected triadic structure of the family of Ihweret and Naneferkaptah. Maternal imagery is an essential aspect of Isis' identity; in *First Setne*, Ihweret and

[160] Cf. the remarks of Griffiths, *Isis-Book*, 47ff. (on the ambivalence of magic in the *Golden Ass*); 24ff. (on sexual excess as a 'Sethian' characteristic, and its relation to ass-imagery).

[161] Vs. Spiegelberg's tentative reading *Tnt-tj-'ȝj* (?); see Spiegelberg, *demotische Chronik*, 11, with n. 1. A more modern transliteration that reflects this reading would be *Ta-Tȋy*; should this reading be correct after all, one might be tempted to think of a connection to *Tȝy, Tȋ.t*, the hypostasized 'image' of Re; compare again Depauw and Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy", 83–84, with n. 64. Spiegelberg in his note to this passage conceded that the first sign following *Tȃ* appears to be a *b*, but considered that the following vertical stroke would more likely belong with a *tȋ*-group. Felber, "demotische Chronik," 79, follows Spiegelberg's first instinct in reading *Ta-bi*. It may be, however, that the vertical stroke in question ought to be read as *w*, rather than taken as part of the *b* (this possibility emerged in discussion of the "Demotic Chronicle" in Prof. Janet Johnson's Demotic seminar at the University of Chicago in the fall quarter of 2005; my thanks to Prof. Johnson for the opportunity to participate in her class).

[162] *LdÄ*, 6: 865–866.

her son Merib are specifically identified with Isis and Harpokrates by virtue of the fact that the pair are buried in Koptos, the location (as the story repeatedly stresses) of a temple to Isis and Harpokrates.[163]

16. *Demand for justice before a divine court*

The image of the divine court is intrinsic to the myth of Osiris, and is ubiquitous in the Ramesside *Horus and Seth* in which Isis is crucial in pressing the case of Horus before the Ennead.[164] The image is also central to Ihweret's tale in *First Setne*.[165] However, this aspect of the Osiris myth is completely inverted in *First Setne*. Here, justice is demanded by the aggrieved party, Thoth. Isis is conspicuous in her absence, and Ihweret's Isis-like attributes are of no avail; for all the goodness that is ascribed to this couple through their resonances with Isis and Osiris, Ihweret and Naneferkaptah are nevertheless found to have fundamentally transgressed against the gods. Unlike the melodramatic Osiris myth, in which the divine hero's destruction is the undeserved outcome of a wanton attack on *ma'at*,[166] Naneferkaptah is a literally tragic hero: one who is all too human and who brings his own destruction upon himself. On the other hand, as the tale is broadened out with the further development of the Setne subplot, we see that Naneferkaptah and Ihweret have, themselves, become identified with the divine order. Naneferkaptah is now Osirian, and he and Ihweret pass their own judgment on Setne. But it is a comic judgment that is conspicuously painful and embarrassing, not fatal, and that results in re-integration and reconciliation, not destruction or exclusion.

---

[163] See Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues and Rites*, 243, with n. 143. Feasting with the priests of Isis and Harpokrates on Naneferkaptah's and Ihweret's arrival in Koptos: Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3: 129–130; Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 457; on Setne's arrival in Koptos, Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3: 136; Ritner, trans., "Setna I," 468. On Koptos as a location sacred to Isis, see Münster, *Göttin Isis*, 171–173; Griffith, *Stories*, 23, n. to *First Setne* 3.25–26.

[164] For discussion, see Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 64–86.

[165] See Jasnow, "And Pharaoh Laughed," 77–78.

[166] See again Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 67; cf. also my "The Accent's on Evil."

Interpretations

Taking all of this into account, we can now to try to answer the hermeneutic questions we posed at the beginning of this discussion: why is the tale of Naneferkaptah presented through first-person narration in the voice of Ihweret, and why is Ihweret such an obviously Isis-like character? I would suggest that, for an Egyptian author in the Graeco-Roman period, the very ubiquity of the myths of Isis and Osiris in literature of so many genres suggested an attractive narratology—natural types of characters, natural types of conflicts, natural plot patterns—that could be adapted in novel plots and contexts. Indeed, it may well have been the case that the myth will have all but imposed itself on many would-be story-tellers. And when it did, the prominence, and the many inflections, of Isis may have made it all but inevitable that the female characters would be drawn more vividly than the male characters.

This is not to say that either Naneferkaptah or Setne are without interest in the story. But Setne is, at the end of the day, a relatively simple stock character: his essential identity as a bumbling anti-hero has antecedents in Egyptian fiction stretching back to *Wenamun* and the *Shipwrecked Sailor*.[167] If he is interesting in this tale, it is largely because the author has put him in interesting situations—situations whose real interest derives from the tale's female characters, Ihweret and Tabubue. Naneferkaptah, for his part, derives his interest primarily from the ways in which he departs from the basic Osiris topos: in the embedded narrative, he partially negates his own goodness through his willful defiance of the gods, and through his suicide; in the framing narrative, he appears as a prankster. On the other hand, the reader sympathizes with him precisely because his character is in other ways fully consistent with the Osiris topos, especially in his undying love for Ihweret.

But because of Isis' active role in the myth of Isis and Osiris, Isis has a far richer persona and more extensive range of characteristics and roles—mother, sister, lover, tale-teller, mourner, defender, avenger, scribe, magician—than does Osiris or any other figure in Egyptian mythology. It was, perhaps, a simple, straightforward and even obvious

[167] Cf. the remarks of Ritner, trans., 'Setna I', 453–454.

procedure to transfer Isis' active role and much of her personality to the two Isis-like characters of Ihweret and Tabubue, each of whom takes a far more extensive part in 'working on' Setne than does Naneferkaptah. Given the numerous cultural precedents for Isis as mourner and as story-teller, the choice to make Ihweret the focalizor and teller of the tale of Naneferkaptah may be best explained as a crucial part of the author's strategy to identify Ihweret with Isis.

And in pursuing this strategy, the author gains considerable dramatic purchase. In the first place, in having Ihweret tell the story, the author is able to increase the dramatic tension of the 'Naneferkaptah' subplot. Once we know that Naneferkaptah is both brother and husband to Ihweret, then we probably begin to suspect that something like the myth of Osiris is being recounted. In one way or another, there is going to be an untimely death and an occasion for mourning. And once we realize that Ihweret is far more far-sighted than Naneferkaptah and that she anticipates disaster from the search for the Book of Thoth, we anticipate it as well, which we might not have done had the story been told from the third person omniscient point of view, or focalized through Naneferkaptah himself. True enough, a third-person narrator or Naneferkaptah could have *told* us that Ihweret was against the expedition, but with the tale focalized through Ihweret, we not only hear her words, we are invited to identify with and even experience her thoughts and fears.

Focalization through Ihweret also serves to increase the pathos of the tale. If a reader sees in Ihweret a reflection of Isis, then he knows how solicitous Ihweret is of her brother/husband and of her child. And finally, there is the dramatic purpose of the tale itself. The story is not told for Setne's amusement (in contrast to the tales told to Khufu in the Westcar cycle), or to comfort or edify him (as is the Sailor's tale in the *Shipwrecked Sailor*). Rather, Ihweret specifically hopes to persuade Setne to abandon his quest for the magic book. And Isis' purpose in telling stories is often to persuade: to force Seth to give up his quest for kingship, or to force a scorpion's poison to retreat from the body of its victim. A character with Isis-like qualities would be the natural focalizor for a tale with the dramatic purpose that Ihweret's tale in fact has. And in focalizing the tale in this way, this Isis-like figure would—as Ihweret in fact does—speak as a witness and act as a defender of the main character in the story.

Context

The ways in which the tale of Naneferkaptah, and *First Setne* as a whole, depart from the pattern of the classical Isis-Osiris myth are significant in establishing the story's historical position and importance. I have claimed more than once above that the Naneferkaptah subplot is genuinely tragic, in that it narrates the story of a fundamentally good man who, through his own stubbornness, defies the moral order of the universe and suffers complete destruction as a result. One possible explanation of this pattern is that it results from increasing awareness on the part of Egyptians in the Graeco-Roman period of Greek tales with precisely such plots. But without discounting this possibility, it may be at least as likely that Egyptian 'tragedy' is a largely independent narratological development that responds to new structures in religious experience and a more complex conception of morality and of the individual in Hellenistic/Roman Egypt. As Assmann has pointed out, the classical view of moral excellence, with its strongly communitarian basis, was now in decline; the judgment of divinity was decisive and the judgments of society might be entirely erroneous.[168] *First Setne* may be consciously ironic in its treatment of the theme of the disjunction of surface appearance with truth, when Ihweret refers to the doomed Naneferkaptah as a "very wise man" (*rmṯ-rḫ m-šs*) invoking the rhetoric of Demotic wisdom texts and their term for a man who lives in harmony with *maʿat* and the divine will.[169] There is a similar disjunction between Setne's estimation of the type of girl that Tabubue is, and her true nature. A recognition (at the level of cultural discourse) that an individual can come to an erroneous judgment as to the nature of the good may well lie at the root of an indigenous Egyptian tragic pattern in the Graeco-Roman period.[170]

---

[168] See again Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 410–414. To Assmann's remarks on the 'underworld' episode in "Second Setne," with its 'first shall be last and the last shall be first' theme, one might also add that the Ptolemaic tale "Isis, the Rich Woman, and the Marsh Woman" treats this theme as well: the poor woman becomes rich through her superior virtue, and the rich woman is required to abase herself to prove her piety.

[169] *First Setne* 4.3; Lichtheim, *AEL*, 3: 131; Ritner, "Setna I," 459; on the term *rmṯ rḫ* 'wise man' cf. Lichtheim, *AEL*, 3: 185; *idem*, *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature*, 45–48; 116–128; *CDD*, R-volume, 58–59.

[170] Even in the Graeco-Roman period, however, it is not easy to identify other clear examples of Egyptian 'tragedy.' One might suggest, as at least a partial example, the framing narrative of the Ptolemaic "Instructions of ʿOnchsheshonqy," in which an Egyptian finds himself forced to choose between his duty to a friend and his duty

Related to this is the extent to which *First Setne* is of a piece with the growing cultural importance of female 'characters' in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods in Egypt. I place 'characters' in quotation marks because within this category I would place not only purely mythical or literary figures, but also Arsinoe II and subsequent Ptolemaic queens, whose public roles were often directly modeled on Isis and who, in their public propaganda and in the religious cults founded to do them honor, drew on many of the motifs and topoi that we have described above.[171] And beyond this, we also find in the late and Ptolemaic periods other instances of lengthy compositions with first-person direct speech by females in one other new and important context: funerary inscriptions, most famously the Ptolemaic inscriptions of Taimhotep[172] and Tathotis,[173] or the similar Saite inscription of Isetemcheb.[174] As Richard Jasnow has recently pointed out,[175] these are obvious, if partial, contemporary comparanda to Ihweret's long narration. While the narrations lack the dramatic features of Ihweret's tale and contain little if any imagery directly related to the Isis-Osiris myth, they do mirror Ihweret's narration in being extended first-person declamations by women, and in being presented as voices from beyond the grave. Lichtheim sees these compositions as a fusion of the Greek tradition of epitaph writing as well as the Egyptian tradition of tomb autobiography,[176] but one might also see in them a reflection of Ptolemaic mourning compositions like Isis' and Nephthys' Lamentations or Songs, with the female mourner here merged with the dear departed.

---

to the king. The conflict is in some respects not unlike that in *Antigone* (cf. Roche, *Tragedy and Comedy*, 74–76), though the worthiness of 'Onchsheshonqy's stance might seem questionable to a modern reader. Moreover, unlike Antigone, 'Onchsheshonqy does not pay the ultimate price for his refusal to put the state before personal/social obligations, and there is no indication that the pharaoh pays any price at all for his insistence upon his own exclusive claim to obedience.

171 The literature on this issue is extensive; Koenen, "Ptolemaic King as Religious Figure" is an extensive examination of all related issues with much bibliography. On Ptolemaic queens more specifically, J. Quaegebeur, "Cleopatra VII and the Cults of the Ptolemaic Queens" may be recommended.

172 Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:59–65; Otto, *Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, 190–194.

173 Vittmann, "Autobiographie der Tathotis."

174 Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3:58–59; Otto, *Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit* 187–188.

175 Jasnow, "Pharaoh Laughed," 74, with n. 79.

176 Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *AEL*, 3: 6–7.

This observation also raises the question of how far *First Setne*'s interest in the feminine may be compared with Greek tales or plots that feature prominent female characters. Here we can point to three distinct phases in the development of the female literary persona in ancient Greek literature: characters like Antigone or Lysistrata from Classical Greek literature; women from the New Comedy known from the Ptolemaic period itself; and the heroines of the Greek romances or novels that mainly date to the Roman period, but that likely have their roots in the Ptolemaic period.[177] To the extent that the 'Naneferkaptah' subplot is correctly characterized as 'tragic,' then it is at least worth considering how far Ihweret's character might be seen as a reflection of the prominence of female characters in Greek tragedy.

But the more compelling comparison between *First Setne* and Greek literature is with Roman-era Greek novels—which suggests that *First Setne* (and Demotic literature more broadly) will have exerted more influence on Greek story-telling than the other way around. It has been repeatedly noted that the Greek novel strongly stresses feminine characters and romantic, mutual love.[178] And it has been pointed out more than once that, at least in a general way, the loving pair of Ihweret and Naneferkaptah in *First Setne* bears comparison with the canonical protagonists of Greek novels—typically a loving, faithful young couple who had fallen in love at first sight.[179] The other element of *First Setne* most often compared to elements in Greek novels is Setne's encounter with Tabubue, which has been compared more than once to the encounter between the Egyptian sage Kalasiris and the *femme fatale* Rhadopis in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*.[180]

---

[177] On this progression, see in general Haynes, *Fashioning the Feminine*, 20 ff.

[178] On the prominence of female characters in the Greek novel, see Haynes, *Fashioning the Feminine*; B. Egger, "Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe;" Johne, "Women in the Ancient Novel." On the prominence of romantic love specifically in Greek novels, cf. Konstan, "Xenophon of Ephesus," 62: "The classical image of *erōs* was that of a one-sided, aggressive and transient passion. The lover was likened to a hunter, and the prey was a young man or woman whose charms inspired the ardour of the pursuer. The Greek novel inaugurates an ideal of *erōs* as the basis of a mutual and lasting union which achieves its ultimate expression in marriage."

[179] Jasnow, "Pharaoh Laughed," 73 with n. 68; Stephens and Winkler, eds., *Ancient Greek Novels*, 12 ff., esp. p. 13.

[180] See Montserrat, *Sex and Society*, 110; 114–115; Jasnow, "Pharaoh Laughed" 76, with n. 92; Rutherford, "Kalasiris and Setne Khamwas" 205. Further discussion in my "They-Who-Must-Be-Obeyed," forthcoming. On *femmes fatales* in the Greek novels, see Haynes, *Fashioning the Feminine*, 102 ff.

Other features of *First Setne* that would appear to look forward to typical elements of Greek novels include the strong emphasis on travel in the story, and especially travel by boat;[181] the prominence of the specific locales of Memphis and Koptos, which are also featured prominently in a number of Greek novels;[182] and the general theme of *metabolé*, or change in fortune. As Ruiz-Montero points out, Greek tragedy has its hero fall from happiness to ruin, which certainly characterizes the Naneferkaptah subplot taken in isolation; but Greek novels trace a fall from, but then a return to, happiness.[183] This is also the overall pattern of *First Setne*, which recounts Naneferkaptah's and Ihweret's fall from their happiness together, through lengthy separation (occasioned by death), to reunion in eternity. And the unusually complex structure of *First Setne*, with its fully-worked-out embedded narrative and its unifying ending, bears comparison with the complex structure of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*, with its embedded stories within embedded stories and its frequent shifts in point of view.

That said, the differences between *First Setne* and the Greek tales to which it has been compared should not be underrated. For example: even though strong and vivid contrasts between good and bad women might appear at first glance to be central to both *First Setne* and to Greek novels, especially in Xenophon and Heliodorus,[184] there are important differences in the way *First Setne* and Greek novels like the *Aithiopika* delineate their respective *femmes fatales*–differences that go to the heart of the meanings of the respective tales. As I have tried to make clear, Tabubue is ultimately a positive character, who appears in a comic episode. Her simultaneously alluring and threatening aspects, and her thematic and dramatic complementarity with Ihweret, have much to do with Egypt's complex conceptualization of the intersection of the divine and the feminine—far less, if anything at all, with any contemporary discourse in Ptolemaic Egypt on the proper place and role of real women in this world. In contrast to this, the women of Greek novels are types that reflect social constructs, not cosmic truths. The role of these *femmes fatales* is largely to emphasize and define, in a negative

[181] On this as an aspect of Greek novels, see Merkelbach, *Isis Regina*, 343; cf. Griffiths, *Isis-Book*, 33ff. (and often) on Isis' connection to ships, shipping and the sea.

[182] See Merkelbach, *Isis Regina*, 346; On Koptos, Memphis and Alexandria (not mentioned in *First Setne*) as locales prominent in other Egyptianizing Greek literature, see also Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues and Rights*, 241ff.

[183] Ruiz-Montero, "Rise of the Greek Novel," 49.

[184] Johne, "Women in the Ancient Novel," 199–201.

sense, the perfections of the novels' respective heroines. If Tabubue or characters like her are in any way ancestral to melodramatic villainesses like Heliodorus' Arsake and Rhadopis, the Greek authors have transformed their Egyptian 'models' into something else altogether, something more acceptable, comprehensible, or entertaining to their own audiences.

It is therefore difficult to judge the significance and extent of the Egyptian contribution to Greek fiction in the Hellenistic and Roman periods with any certainty, and I hesitate to make here any detailed claims about texts other than *First Setne*.[185] The origin of the Graeco-Roman novel ought in principle to be highly overdetermined, and many of the streams of tradition that flow together in these novels are clearly to be traced back to Greek sources: the traditions of historiography, rhetoric, epic, and others. Neither can influences from non-Egyptian Near Eastern cultures be overlooked.[186] But it is striking to observe the extent to which *First Setne*, and especially its 'Naneferkaptah' subplot, is a clear example of a complete fictionalization and reworking of the myth of Isis and Osiris in an entirely Egyptian context. *First Setne* clearly inhabits the same intellectual universe as that inhabited by Egyptian ritual texts that thematize the myth of Isis and Osiris, but it also responds to new cultural and intellectual developments in Hellenistic Egypt—ideas about Isis, ideas about the nature of the individual, about the nature of morality. Perhaps in consequence, *First Setne* appears to contain in embryo more than one element that comes to typify Graeco-Roman novels.

Needless to say, even if these correspondences are evidence of real connections between Egyptian tales and Greek novelistic fiction, *First Setne* itself should not be viewed as directly ancestral to any particular Greek novel or romance—at least, not any of those currently known to us.[187] Even though *First Setne* appears to us to be, in some respects, unique in Egypt's preserved literary legacy, it is likely to have been at

[185] For discussion of Demotic Egyptian fiction in the context of its relationship to the Greek novel, see Tait, "Egyptian Fiction in Demotic and Greek" for a wider discussion of Egyptian literature generally in this context, see Griffiths, *Isis-Book*, 20 ff.

[186] See Ruiz-Montero, "Rise of the Greek Novel."

[187] Rutherford, "Kalasiris and Setne Khaemwas" 205, argues that Setne Khaemwas may be the direct prototype of Heliodorus' Kalasiris in the *Aithiopika*. As with the parallels between Tabubue and Arsake and Rhadopis, I would expect that if there is any connection, it would be very indirect and involve substantial transformations as the character made the jump from an Egyptian to a Greek fictional world. *First Setne* has, on the other hand, had a surprisingly active *Nachleben* in modern popular fiction

least approximately representative of a larger genre, or genre complex, that comprised tales with many of these characteristics. Demotic Egyptian tales like *First Setne* may well comprise an important source—one among many—for some of the basic structures, themes and images of the Graeco-Roman novel. But the real importance of *First Setne*, as well as other Demotic tales both known and yet to be discovered, is the way in which they illuminate the cultural and intellectual fabric of their home culture: the still-sophisticated, still-vital culture of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt.

and cinema since its initial decipherment by Brugsch in 1867; see discussions in Ritner, trans., "Setna I" 454, and in my "They-Who-Must-Be-Obeyed" forthcoming.

BILISTICHE AND THE PROMINENCE OF COURTESANS IN THE PTOLEMAIC TRADITION*

Daniel Ogden

How do we know what we know about the various courtesans of the Ptolemaic kings? The randomness and almost entirely fragmentary nature of the material surviving in the tradition for them invites the immediate response 'quite by chance'. It is indeed appropriate enough to credit 'chance' (i.e. the sum of all the processes of retention, selection, abandonment and destruction of texts and monuments that have intervened between the ancient world and our own age) with the preservation or suppression of data about the courtesans in the tradition. But how did that data get into the tradition in the first place? It is likely to have done so because the kings either actively promoted them and their image or heedlessly flaunted them. This chapter proceeds on the basis that most of what we hear about the Ptolemaic courtesans, for good or ill, comes to us because, at some point prior to their entry into the texts, the women were indeed publicly promoted, in some shape or form, by their kings. It then asks whether any significant pattern within a dynastic system may be detected behind such promotion, and tentatively suggests that it may.

The Courtesans of Ptolemy I Soter

We can name up to three women who may have been courtesans of Soter, Thais, Lamia, and, arguably Berenice, but, for different reasons, it seems that none of them can be considered to have been publicly promoted *qua* courtesan by him. The following fragment of Cleitarchus is our only key to Thais'[1] apparently important role in Soter's life:

* Abbreviations: *PP* = Peremans and Van 't Dack, 1950–1981; *SH* = Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, 1983; *Syll.*[3] = Dittenberger 1915–1924.

[1] *PP* no. 14723; Berve 1926 no. 359.

> And was it not the case that Alexander the Great kept Thais, the Athenian courtesan, by his side?[2] Clitarchus says of her that she was the cause of the burning of the Persepolis palace. This Thais, after the death of Alexander, also (καί) married Ptolemy, the first one to rule Egypt, and she bore him Leontiscus and Lagus, and a daughter Eirene, whom Eunostus, king of Soli in Cyprus, married. (Athenaeus 576de, inc. Cleitarchus *FGrHist* 137 F11)

The other sources bearing upon Thais concentrate, in what is evidently a highly fictionalised and dramatic fashion, on her role in the Persepolis story during Alexander's campaign.[3] All the literary sources to name her support the simple impression conveyed by Athenaeus and Clitarchus that she was a courtesan of Alexander's until the latter's death, whereupon Ptolemy married her and began to sire children from her. There is nothing here to suggest that Soter promoted Thais in the role of courtesan. Not only do we learn nothing of her in her Ptolemaic context beyond the facts of her marriage and maternity to three of Soter's children, but Athenaeus and Clitarchus imply that Ptolemy only knew her in the role of wife. However, Bennett has recently contended that she was by Ptolemy's side before 323, with the wedding constituting a legitimation of a long-standing camp relationship, this only becoming possible after Alexander's death. His considerations relating to the ages of her male children are fairly compelling: both were presumably adult at the time that Lagus won his victory in the Lycaean games of 308/7[4] and Leontiscus was captured at the battle of Salamis in 306.[5] This would mean that Lagus was born by 326 at the latest. Less compelling is his contention that the relationship began as early as ca. 335 on the basis that her daughter Eirene was married to Eunostus of Soli in the context of Soter's conquest of Cyprus in ca. 320.[6] Nonetheless, are we to infer that Thais had been shared by Alexander and Ptolemy? Or is her association with Alexander wholly fictitious?[7]

---

[2] The speculation of Bevan 1927:53 n. 3 that she was rather an Egyptian named Ta-Isis need not detain us.

[3] Diodorus 17.72, Curtius 5.7.2–11 and Plutarch *Alexander* 38. There is no mention of Thais' involvement in the burning of the palace at Arrian Anabasis 3.18.11. If her role in it had been a historical one, then it is possible that Ptolemy passed over it in silence in the history of which Arrian made so much use.

[4] *Syll.*[3] no. 314 (Lycaean victories) B v line 7.

[5] Justin 15.12.

[6] Bennett 2005 s.*vv.* 'Lagus' (son of Soter), 'Leontiscus' and 'Eirene' (daughter of Ptolemy I). The dating conjectured for Eunostus' career is compromised by too many weak speculations.

[7] Tarn Alexander ii 47–48, 82–83, 324 contended that Alexander had no relation-

It perhaps remains possible to hold that she was with Alexander until Persepolis in 330, whereupon she was transferred to Ptolemy.

The second courtesan associated with Soter, Lamia, is the single Hellenistic royal courtesan of whom we know most,[8] but unfortunately the light of history only begins to shine upon her at the point at which she is detached from Ptolemy's control or employ by Demetrius at the Battle of Salamis in 306:

> Not a single thing escaped Demetrius' clutches from the hordes of [sc. Ptolemy's] servants and friends and women, which were moored nearby in merchant ships, nor yet of his weapons, money and siege engines, but he seized the lot and brought it back to his camp. Amongst these was the famous Lamia. She had first attracted admiration for her skill, for it seemed hard to dismiss her flute playing, but later on she became renowned for sex too. But at that point, although her prime was past, and Demetrius was himself much younger than she was, she captured his heart, conquered him with her grace and held him enthralled to such an extent that she was the only woman he pursued, whilst other women would pursue him. (Plutarch *Demetrius* 16)

It has recently been contended that Plutarch's account here of her acquisition does not license the supposition that she was Soter's personal courtesan, as opposed to that of one of his retinue,[9] but this still strikes the current author as the most natural reading of Plurarch's text. But again it is significant that we learn nothing whatsoever of her career at Soter's court.

Finally, it remains possible that Berenice, ultimately the super-legitimated mother of Soter and Arsinoe II (whom we now know from the Milan Posidippus to have been of Eordaean descent),[10] first entered

---

ship with her, but the vigor with which he pursued his agenda to desexualise Alexander in these pages is notorious.

[8] *PP* no. 14727. The sources are: Plutarch *Demetrius* 10, 16 and 23–27 (including Philippides F25 K-A and *adepsota* F698 K-A and quoting Lynceus of Samos and Demochares of Soli *FGH* 75 F7); Athenaeus 101e (including Lynceus of Samos), 128b (including Lynceus), 252f.–253b (including Demochares *FGH* 75 F1 and Polemon F13 Preller), 577c–f (including Polemon F45–46 Preller and Machon F12–13 Gow) and 614ef (including Phylarchus *FGH* 81 F12); Clement *Protrepticus* 4.48; Alciphron 4.16 and 17; Aelian *Varia historia* 12.17 and 13.8–9; Diogenes Laertius 5.76 (inculding Favorinus *FHG* iii 578 F8); Choiroboskos Bekker *Anecdota Graeca* 1395. For discussion see Ogden 1999:173–177 and 219–268, *passim*. The evidence for Lamia and her career in relation to that of Demetrius career has now been subjected to detailed analysis by Wheatley 2003.

[9] Thus Wheatley 2003:31 and Bennet 2005 *s.v.* 'Lamia'.

[10] Posidippus no. 88 Austin/Bastianini.

Soter's bed in the guise of courtesan.[11] Soter had first encountered her in the role of a lady-in-waiting to his earlier-married wife Eurydice, and Pausanias asserts (albeit perhaps reflecting subsequent Philadelphan propaganda) that it was a love match.[12] The relationship must have begun by about 316, since her daughter Arsinoe II was married to Lysimachus soon after the Battle if Ipsus in 300.[13] She was not only married by ca. 299, when Pyrrhus encountered her, but by this point the most influential of all Soter's wives.[14] However, it should be stressed that the possibility that Berenice passed through a phase of courtesan status depends upon (admittedly respectable) modern inference: it is in no way projected by the ancient sources.

But none of this gets us very far in trying to understand Soter's courtesans as part of a dynastic system as such. Almost everything we know about Thais relates to the period before Ptolemy entered Egypt, and probably to the time when she belonged to Alexander. Everything we know about Lamia relates to the period after Demetrius took her from Ptolemy. According to the strictest interpretation of the concept of a dynastic system, this only came into existence for Ptolemy in 306 at the point at which he lost Lamia, had already been *married* to Thais for almost two decades, and doubtless to Berenice for one decade.

Athenaeus' List of Philadelphus' Courtesans

We find a very different situation when we turn to the reign of Philadelphus, to whom our sources attribute up to eleven courtesans in all, more than to any other Hellenistic king.[15] The starting-point for all discussions of Philadelphus' courtesans is the passage of Athenaeus (following on directly from that quoted above), which preserves two important fragments, one from the *Commentaries* of Ptolemy Physcon, and one from Polybius:

> And the second king of Egypt, surnamed Philadelphus (Φιλάδελφος δ' ἐπίκλην), as Ptolemy Euergetes recounts in the third book of his

[11] Thus, most recently, Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 18; but at 29 she contradictorily contends that it would have been out of the question for Philadelphus to marry his courtesan Bilistiche after the death of his wife Arsinoe II.

[12] Pausanias 1.6.8–1.7.1.

[13] Plutarch *Demetrius* 31; cf. Bennett *s.v.* 'Arsinoe II'.

[14] Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 4.4.

[15] Ogden 1999:221–222.

> *Commentaries*, had a great many girlfriends (ἐρωμένας), Didyme one of the native women, extraordinarily beautiful to see, and Bilistiche, and also Agathocleia and Stratonice, whose great memorial stood by the sea at Eleusis, and Myrtion and a great many more, since he had a strong sex drive. In the fourteenth book of his *Histories* Polybius says that many statues of Cleino, his wine-pourer, were dedicated the length and breadth of Alexandria. She was depicted wearing just a tunic and with drinking horn in hand. 'Are not the most beautiful houses called Myrtion's, Mnesis' and Potheine's?', he says. But Mnesis was a flute girl, Potheine too, whilst Myrtion was one of the mime actresses, exposed before the public. (Athenaeus 576ef, inc. Ptolemy VIII Physcon *FGrHist* 234 F4 Polybius 14.11.2)

Here we find mention of eight courtesans in all. What more can we know of these women and the manner of their projections? For five of Athenaeus' women we have little or nothing to add to the information he gives us: Agathocleia,[16] Myrtion,[17] Cleino,[18] Mnesis[19] and Potheine.[20] Some have thought that the Agathocleia of Athenaeus' list may represent a ghost of Philopator's famous courtesan Agathocleia,[21] but Physcon ought to have known what he was talking about, and if she did have a separate existence, them some potentially interesting conclusions may follow (see below).[22] Myrtion is the only courtesan Athenaeus positively implies to have been mentioned by both Physcon and Polybius. Athenaeus gives the same information about Cleino elsewhere, at which point he also tells us that she was mentioned by Ptolemy of Megalopolis in the third book of his *Histories of Philopator*.[23] There is no strong reason to identify her with the woman of this name, a daughter of one Admetus, who dedicated silver statuettes of Apollo and Artemis at Delos before 279.[24] Bennett seems to me to infer it improperly from Polybius' recycled words that Potheine (and presumably too *ipso facto*) Myrtion and Mnesis owned houses amongst the finest in Alexandria.[25]

---

[16] *PP* no. 14713.
[17] *PP* no. 14729.
[18] *PP* no. 14726.
[19] *PP* no. 14728.
[20] *PP* no. 14732. Cf. Bennett 2005 *s.vv.* 'Agathoclea', 'Myrtion', 'Cleino', 'Mnesis' and 'Potheine.'
[21] For the ghost theory see Mass 1946:74, Hauben 1975:290, Pomeroy 1984:53 and Bennett 2005 s.v. 'Agathoclea' (of Philadelphus).
[22] Cf. Ogden 1999:248, 251–252.
[23] Athenaeus 425e (including Ptolemy of Megalopolis *FGH* 161 F3 and Polybius 14.11.1); cf. Ogden 1999:223, 232, 239 and 260.
[24] Thus Tréheux 1957 and Bennett 2005 s.v. 'Cleino'.
[25] Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Potheine.'

Of the remaining women mentioned by Athaenaeus here, there is rather more to say about Didyme,[26] Stratonice and in particular Bilistiche, the last of whom will receive separate treatment below.

Physcon and Athenaeus describe Didyme as one of the Egyptian women, of outstanding beauty. Her Greek name Didyme ('Twin') no doubt supplemented a native Egyptian one ('Hatre'?),[27] and as Cameron has noted, the name Didyme, together with its masculine equivalent Didymus, are frequently sported by ethnic Egyptians.[28] It is likely that it is she that is described by Asclepiades in the following epigram:

> Didyme carried me away with her eye. Alas, in seeing beauty, I melt like wax beside fire. If she is black, what of it? So are embers, but when we heat them, they glow like rosebuds. (Asclepiades *PA* 5.210 = Gow and Page 1965 no. v lines 828–831)

The blackness of Didyme in Asclepiades' epigram need not speak of anything darker than an average Egyptian skin-colour, since the Greeks regularly referred to the Egyptians as black-skinned.[29] I think Cameron goes too far in constructing a more anxious and contentious context for the poem, supposing as he does that the Greek audience to the court poem on Didyme may have been critical of the liaison.[30] This poem highlights the important role of poets, whether 'of the court' or not, in managing public perceptions of, and indeed no doubt basic awareness of, the royal courtesans, and further examples of this will follow. It is in general impossible to tell if this is rooted in any significant and serious interactions between courtesans and poets, although one may well imagine them encountering each other on a regular basis at royal symposia. It should be admitted that the notion that Asclepiades was himself based, in any way, in the Alexandrian court depends upon no evidence more direct than this poem itself. The Didyme poem might be thought to raise the question in its consumers' minds as to whether Asclepiades himself was celebrating, revealing or hinting at

[26] *PP* no. 14719.

[27] Ogden 1999:249; Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 25.

[28] Cameron 1990:287–288.

[29] The point is made at length by Cameron 1990:287–289, citing numerous examples. I do not regard his speculations, 290, about Didyme's eye being the more striking for standing out against a dark face as plausible. Cf, also Pomeroy 1984:55 and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 19.

[30] Cameron 1990:287–295.

a relationship between Didyme and himself, improbable as this may seem. Cameron rightly points out that the poem speaks only of the impact of Didyme's beauty on Asclepiades' emotions. But Machon's *Chreiai*, for what they are worth here, do portray a world of symposia in which the Antigonid Demetrius Poliorcetes and the comic playwright Diphilus appear to share courtesans.[31]

Athenaeus and Physcon tell that Stratonice's[32] funerary monument used to stand by the shore at Egyptian Eleusis. The monuments erected to courtesans evidently had an important role in preserving traditions about them and perhaps generating and developing new ones. Amongst Philadelphus' other courtesans, we may note that Glauce also had an inscribed tomb, Bilistiche had a temple (as well as having her name on inscribed victory and canephorate lists), and Cleino had statues throughout Alexandria (see the various dedicated treatments).[33]

We may have a further garbled reference to Stratonice from a scholiast to Lucian. A passing reference in Lucian's *Icaromenippus* "Ptolemy in bed with his wife" is explained by the scholiast with "Ptolemy, surnamed Philadelphus, took his own sister Stratonice to wife."[34] This is obviously gibberish as it stands. Whilst there may lurk behind this the information that Ptolemy took his courtesan named Stratonice to bed with him, it is more likely that a copyist has substituted the correct name 'Arsinoe' with the name 'Stratonice', since the scholiast goes on immediately to talk of Stratonice, daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes and wife, in turn, of Seleucus I and Antiochus I. The case for indentifying this Stratonice with Stratonice the wife of Archagathus, the *epistates* of Libya,[35] first made by Moretti and recently championed again by Bennett,[36] is peculiarly thin and depends upon no more than the coincidence of name.[37] Nor need we be delayed by attempts to identify her as an otherwise unknown daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes.[38] The basis for this theory is a statue dedication made by a Stratonice,

---

[31] Cf. Ogden 1999:233–234, with the sources cited there.

[32] *PP* no. 14733 and cf. no. 14570.

[33] For the association of Hellenistic royal courtesans with monuments more generally, and the role of these in generating traditions about them, see Ogden 1999:262–265.

[34] Scholiast Lucian *Icaromenippus* 15.

[35] Known from *SEG* xviii no. 636.

[36] Moretti 1965:173, Bagnall 1976:195 and Bennett 2005 s.v. 'Stratonice'.

[37] The identification is dismissed by Fraser 1956:54 and 1972:ii 427 n. 676.

[38] As Moretti 19765:173 and Bagnall 1976:195.

daughter of Demetrius, to Arsinoe II:[39] this text manifestly refers to the same well-known Antigonid princess and Seleucid queen of this name.[40]

Cameron tried to press further chronological data from the fragment of Physcon's Commentaries. His point was a simple one: since the courtesans here are not listed in alphabetical order, they must be listed in a chronological one.[41] This is impossible to verify, because we have chronologically specific data of any kind for one of Philadelphus' courtesans, Bilistiche. Cameron had an agenda: he wanted to push Didyme into the early part of Philadelphus' rein so as to be able to identify the same as a *floruit* for Asclepiades. This is all the speculation, perhaps, of an over-ordered mind. The courtesans need not be listed in any order at all, and if one is to believe that they are, one may as well suggest, given the content of the gloss on Didyme, the first in the series, that they are listed in order of beauty. Physcon would surely have found it difficult to list the courtesans in chronological order unless the role of royal courtesan had been formalised to the point of constituting an office, the occupants of which might be recorded as such in the documents of the court. Such an office need not have borne 'courtesan' *vel sim.* in its title. The favourite of the moment may, for example, have been assigned a minor annual religious role (one thinks of Bilistiche serving in the major annual role of canephore).

Potential Courtesans of Philadelphus Excluded from Athenaeus' List

We also hear of three further potential courtesans of Philadelphus who are not included in Athenaeus' list: Hippe (likely), Aglais (unlikely) and Glauce (likely). For all that, Athenaeus (elsewhere) remains the most important source of information about the former two. What can we know of these? The principal source of information about Hippe[42] is a fragment of Machon Athenaeus preserves for us:

> They say that Hippe the courtesan had Theodotus for a lover, who at that time was Keeper of the Fodder. Once, she arrived late in the day at a drinking party at king Ptolemy's. For she always used to drink with

[39] *OGIS* 14.

[40] As Macurdy 1932:80 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Stratonice'. Huss 2001:201 n. 89 now argues that *OGIS* 14 is a fake, largely because of the perceived difficulty of identifying the Stratonice it mentions (see Bennett's observations).

[41] Cameron 1990:290.

[42] *PP* no. 14725.

> him. So, excessively late as she was, she said, 'Dear old Ptolemy, I'm desperately thirsty. Have four cups poured together into one big one for me to drink.' Whereupon the king replied, 'Into the drinking-trough, rather, for, Hippe, you seem to me to have devoured a great deal of fodder'. (Athenaeus 583ab, citing Machon F18 Gow lines 439–449)[43]

The tale is also recycled by Eustathius, who provides a little more context than that offered by Athenaeus:

> 'Hippe', the name of a courtesan who, they say, took Theodotus, the one in charge of the royal fodder, as a lover, and, arriving late in the day at a drinking party, that is a symposium, at king Ptolemy's, said, 'Ptolemy, have four cups poured out for me, and then poured into a big one'. But the king said, 'Into a drinking-trough more like, for you seem to me, Hippe, to have devoured a great deal of fodder'. The king either mocked her in his drunkenness by making reference to fodder, since her name was derived from 'horse', or by making reference to Theodotus, the keeper of the royal fodder. When a horse is full of fodder it is induced to drink a lot. And it is clear, that just as Hippe was named from the horse… (Eustathius 1224.50 on Homer *Iliad* 21.79)

Neither of these tales makes it clear which Ptolemy is the subject, and for some minds this in itself may be cause for suspicion. Some scholars have supposed it to refer to Ptolemy IV, but, as Gow has demonstrated, the most likely *floruit* for Machon is in ca. 260–50 BC,[44] which leaves us to choose rather between Soter and Philadelphus. Now, although Soter is (just about) known to have had courtesans, as we have just seen, Philadelphus seems by far the more obvious candidate, not least because the anecdote constructs as its setting a court characterised by luxury and wit. It should also be said that whatever the date of composition, the fragments of Machon from which a date of setting can be derived relate to the reign of Demetrius Poliorcetes, and this again accordingly puts Philadelphus primarily in the frame. Most scholars accordingly continue to prefer to associate Hippe with Philadelphus.[45]

---

[43] Cf. Ogden 1999:225–226, 259.

[44] Gow 1965:10–11; cf. Ogden 1999:226. But Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Hippe' now suggests that Machon's *floruit* was the later second century BC and that he was accordingly the contemporary of Philopator. This is argued on the basis of the facts that an epitaph was written for him by the early second-century BC writer of epigrams, Dioscurides (but a mere literary exercise?), and that Machon was the teacher of Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose *floruit* was ca. 200 BC.

[45] Ptolemy II is advocated by Gulick 1927–1941 *ad loc.*, Gow 1965:10–11 and *ad loc.* and Ogden 1999:235 (cf. 261). Bouché-Leclerq 1903–1907:i 331, Otto 1913 and Peremans and Van 't Dack 1950–1981 no. 14725 prefer Ptolemy IV. Bennett 2005 *s.v.*

We may also add that the the discovery of the Milan Posidippus with its *Hippika* (nos. 71–88 Austin/Bastianini) indicates the interest in and exploitation of chariot racing by Philadelphus' court to a new degree, and confirms the impression that that is where the anecdote takes its setting.[46]

There is a striking degree of over-determination in the joke. The king's joke is sufficiently justified by the fact that the courtesan is called Hippe, 'Horse'. And the use of her name in this way may carry innuendo, given the Greek use of horse-imagery for sexual positions (*kelês*: see below).[47] The character of Theodotus, keeper of the fodder, seems to have been introduced in order to produce the same sort of innuendo effect in a less sophisticated way. This confirms what we might in any case have suspected, namely that there is a high degree of fictionalisation in this story.[48] The degree of over-determination can perhaps be reduced if we assume, historicizingly, with Gow, that the courtesan came to acquire the name Hippe precisely because of her association with the keeper of the fodder. But this seems to stretch belief.[49] Attempts to identify Theodotus are limited to the hypothesis that Hippe belongs with Ptolemy IV. The keeper of the fodder, *chortophylax*, was doubtless an exalted royal office; Eusebius implies as such in his phase *basilikos chortos*. If Theodotus was a historical figure then it may be that Hippe was shared between him and the king.[50]

Aglais[51] is described by Athenaeus and Aelian in closely similar terms (and both cite Posidippus):

> And a woman Aglais, the daughter of Megacles, played the processional march on the trumpet in the first grand Alexandrian procession. She had a wig and a crest on her head, as Posidippus tells us in his epigrams. She could eat twelve pounds of meat, four *choinikes* of bread, and drink a flagon of wine. (Athenaeus 415ab, including Posidippus F3 Schott = no. 143 Austin/Bastianini = *SH* 702)[52]

'Hippe' discusses the woman under Ptolemy IV to whom he ascribes the woman 'probably', whilst noting the attraction of associating her rather with Ptolemy II.

[46] Cf. Fantuzzi 2004 and Kosmetatou 2004b on the *Hippika*.

[47] Cf. Ogden 1999:260.

[48] Cf. Ogden 1999:219.

[49] Gow 1965 on Machon F18 Gow lines 439–449.

[50] Cf. Ogden 1999:235.

[51] Not given a number in *PP*.

[52] So too Aelian *VH* 1.26.; cf. Ogden 1999:260 and 267 and Bennett 2005 s.v. 'Aglais.'

Aglais' trumpet is a non-sympotic instrument, it may be felt that there is, accordingly, little basis for considering Aglais a courtesan at all. However, the attention paid to her gargantuan appetite for drink is reminiscent of the projection of Hippe just discussed, and we may also note the coincidence between Aglais's four *choinikes* (a *choinix*, normally being a liquid measure) and Hippe's four cups.

Pliny describes the Chian *hetaira* Glauce,[53] who is not mentioned by Athenaeus, as lyre-player to King Ptolemy:

> And we also hear of the love of the goose of Aegium, which fell in love with the beauty of a boy called Amphilochus of Olenus, and we hear of Glauce, lyre-player to king Ptolemy, whom a ram too is said to have loved at the same time. (Pliny *Natural History* 10.51)[54]

She is mentioned twice by Philadelphus' court poet Theocritus:

> *Epigram of the bucolic Theocritus on the girl Glauce, a courtesan.*[55] What tomb this is and who is beneath it the legend will tell you. I am the tomb of the renowned Glauce. (Theocritus *Epigram* 23 = *Palatine Anthology* 7.262)

> I can play too, and I'm especially good at the tunes of Glauce and those of Pyrrhus. (Theocritus *Idyll* 4.31)

The scholiast to the latter passage similarly locates her in the age of Philadelphus, although perhaps only by extrapolation from the fact that she is mentioned by Theocritus, and adds a fragment of Theophrastus:

> Glauce was Chian by birth, a string-player. She was born in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Theophrastus says that a ram fell in love with her. (Scholiast Theocritus *ad loc.*, including Theophrastus F567c Fortenbaugh)

The poet Hedylus, also of the age of Philadelphus, also mentioned her:

> He [Theon] piped the drunken play-tunes (*paignia*) of the Muses of Glauce. (Hedylus Gow and Page 1965 no. 10 *apud* Athenaeus 176c)[56]

It perhaps remains conceivable, *pace* Theophrastus, that Glauce was born fully formed from the head of Theocritus. Whatever her historical dimension, she was taken up avidly by the literary tradition, which,

---

[53] *PP* no. 14718.

[54] Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Glauce' is sceptical about her having had any connection with Philadelphus, but what are we then to do with Pliny?

[55] The Palatine anthology's titular explanation of the epigram is presumably reliable, although it may have generated it from the traditions about Glauce that had developed in the meantime. It therefore remains conceivable that Theocritus' epigram was not intended to relate to the same Glauce.

[56] For the dating and context of Hedylus, see Fraser 1971:i 558 and 571–575.

continuing after Theocritus and Hedylus, cited her as a short-hand for the most beautiful *kithara* music.[57] But it was particularly taken with the notion that her beauty and her music should have persuaded an animal to fall in love with her. The idea is first found in Theophrastus, as quoted, but it has the ring of hellenistic poetry about it, and so it too may have originated in Theocritus or a colleague. The developing tradition (with which the Pliny text quoted above should be included) opened up the range of Glauce's animal lovers:[58]

> I will accordingly pass over the goose that pursued a boy in Aegium and the ram that conceived a desire for Glauce the lyre-player, for they are very famous and I suspect that you have had your fill from so many accounts. (Plutarch *Moralia* 972f., *De sollertia animalium*)
>
> I know that a dog fell in love with Glauce the lyre-player. But some say that it was not a dog, but a ram, and others again a goose. And a dog fell in love with a boy, whose name was Xenophon, in Soli in Cilicia. A jackdaw fell sick because of the beauty of another attractive lad in Sparta. (Aelian *Nature of animals* 1.6)
>
> In Aegium in Achaea a goose fell in love with an attractive boy, Olenian by birth, by the name of Amphilochus. Theophrastus tells this. The boy was being kept with the Olenian exiles in Aegium. So the goose used to bring gifts to him. And there is nothing surprising in the fact that people fell in love with the lyre-player Glauce in Chios, for she was very beautiful. But a ram and a goose also fell in love with the same woman, as I hear. (Aelian *Nature of animals* 5.29, including Theophrastus F567b Fortenbaugh)
>
> In his poem *Dardanica* Hegemon speaks, inter alia, of Aleuas of Thessaly, and in this he also says that a dragon-snake (δράκων) fell in love with him … If a ram was overwhelmed by Glauce the lyre-player, and a dolphin with an ephebe in Iasus, what it to stop a dragon-snake from falling in love with an attractive neatherd, or the most sharp-eyed creature becoming a good judge of outstanding beauty? (Aelian *Nature on animals* 8.11, including Hegemon F462 *SH* = *FGrHist* 110 F1)

Also, a late hellenistic vase apparently illustrates Glauce's harp-playing in the act of attracting the goose.[59] Pliny, Plutarch and Aelian preserve Glauce's animal lovers in the context of series of exempla of animals of

---

[57] Thus Plutarch *Moralia* 397a. For her instrument as a cithara, see Plutarch *Moralia* 397a and 972f., Aelian *Nature of animals* 1.6, 5.29 (including Theophrastus F567b Fortenbaugh) and 8.11 and *Varia historia* 9.39 and Pliny *Natural history* 10.51. The scholiast to Theocritus 4.31 describes her more vaguely as a *kroumatopoiios*.

[58] Cf. Ogden 1999:219, 259.

[59] See Thompson 1964.

various species falling in love with various humans, and this is no doubt the sort of context in which it thrived.[60] This goes some way towards explaining the variety of the animals with which Glauce is associated: doubtless, for example, she acquired the ram by association with the tale of Amphilochus of Olenus. If Theocritus' epitaph was genuine, then it may imply that she had a relatively prominent and elaborate tomb.

Bilistiche

But the mistress of Philadelphus to have left by far the most traces in the record, documentary and literary, is Bilistiche,[61] and she seems to have enjoyed a peculiar prominence, although there is no particular indication of this in the Athenaeus-Physcon fragment. This is a timely occasion to review the evidence for her career, because there is so much to disagree with in three recent treatments of her, those of Cameron, Kosmetatou and Bennett. The first foists upon her a possibly Posidippan poem that surely has little to do with her in fact; the second foists upon her a speculative concocted biography, in which the ambitious woman suppressed her Tyrian origins (which even so remain visible to us) and transformed herself into a grand Macedonian lady of the court; and the third foists upon her a child, Ptolemy Andromachou, on a wholly arbitrary basis.[62] We have some nine or eleven extant references to her overall, more, that is, than to any other courtesan with the exception of the notorious Lamia.[63] Furthermore, just about every one of these references seems to mark her out as a rather exceptional courtesan.

---

[60] Cf. Maas 1912, Gow 1952: ii pp. 83 and 546–547, Gow and Page 1965 ii pp. 296–297, Fraser 1972:i 558, 573 and ii 818 n. 165.

[61] *PP* no. 14717.

[62] Cameron 1990:295–304, Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 24–29 and Bennett 2005 *s.vv.* 'Bilistiche' and 'Ptolemy Andromachou'. Kosmetatou's claim ('Bilistiche', 18) that the discovery of the Milan Posidippus has transformed our understanding of Bilistiche seems to me completely groundless: she is simply not mentioned in these poems.

[63] The sources for Bilistiche are: (1) Athenaeus 576ef (including Ptolemy VIII Physcon *FGH* 234 F4) and (2) 596e; (3) Plutarch *Moralia* 753ef (*Eroticus*); (4) Pausanias 5.8.11; (5) Phlegon of Tralles (?) *Olympic chronology* = *FGHist* 257a F6 = *P. Oxy.* 2082 F6 lines 6–8; (6) Suda *s.v.* Σωτάδης; (7) Clement of Alexandria *Protrepticus* 4.42; (8) *Life of Sotades* p. 114 Westermann; (9) Eusebius *Chronicles* i 207 Schöne. Probable (and

Bilistiche distinguished herself in both secular and religious spheres. As to the former, she won splendid Olympic chariot victories in adjacent Olympiads. The sources for this will all derive ultimately from official victor lists.[64] Pausanias tells that she won in 264 with a pair of foals, whilst Eusebius tells us that in this year the victor in the pair of foals was *Philistiakus Maketi*, apparently a corruption of Βιλιστίχη Μακετίς, 'Bilistiche of Macedon':[65]

> At a later point they added both the race for the pair of foals [sc. to the Olympics] and that for the foal and jockey. They say that Belistiche from the Macedonian seaboard was proclaimed victor in the pair, and Tlepolemos the Lycian in the foal and jockey. The latter won in the 131st olympiad, and Belistiche in the third before this. (Pausanias 5.8.11)[66]

And a fragment of an *Olympic chronology* in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus, tentatively assigned to Phlegon of Tralles, tells that the victor in the 268 four-foal chariot-race was a courtesan of Philadelphus. Her name is lost from the fragment, but enough letters of the woman's ethnic survive to show that it read 'Bilistiche the Macedonian'.

> 268 BC: [four]-foal chariot-race victory of [Bilistiche the Ma]cedonian (?). She is the [hetaira] of Ptolemy Philadelphus. (Phlegon of Tralles? *Olympic chronology* = *FGrHist* 257a F6 = *P. Oxy*. 2082 F6 lines 6–8)[67]

---

important) references to Bilistiche are to be found at (10). *P.Cair.Zen*. ii 59289 and (11) *P.Dem Zeno* 6b. A possible (12) might be constituted by *P. Hibeh* ii 261–262, but it seems unlikely that this refers to the same Bilistiche, although it is almost certain that this refers rather to a woman named after her. All these references are discussed in detail below.

[64] Cf. Ogden 1999:265 and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 22.

[65] Eusebius *Chronicles* i 207 Schöne.

[66] Pausanias dates the victory to the 'third' olympiad before the 131st. If we count inclusively, we arrive at the 264 Olympics, and so match Eusebius perfectly. If we count exclusively, we arrive at 268, which coincides in year with the victory recorded in the Olympic chronology, but not in race: for the *Olympic chronology* makes the 268 victory a victory in the four-foal chariot race. See Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Bilistiche'.

[67] Phlegon of Tralles (?) *Olympic chronology FGH* 257a F6 = *P.Oxy*. 2082 lines 6–8. The restorations of 'Bilistiche' and 'Macedonian' are made by the Oxyrhynchus editor, A.S. Hunt, but Jacoby on Phlegon *ad loc*. (p. 852) did not have the confidence to print them, and they have been doubted more recently by Criscuolo 2003:319–320. However, most do accept them as secure: thus Moretti 1957:136–137, Fraser 1972:ii 210 n. 206 (considering them certain), Cameron 1990:302 n. 52 (noting that the traces of the word ἑταίρα are faint, but that no plausible alternative suggests itself) and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 19–22, the last with a vigorous defence. Fraser 1972:i 210 n. 206 gives 264 and 260 as the date for Bilistiche's Olympic victories, presumably by mistake: cf. Cameron 1990:298.

The new Posidippus epigrams suggest that the queens of the Ptolemaic court at any rate regularly entered Olympic chariot teams: epigrams imply this for Berenice I, Arsinoe II and Berenice Phernophorus or Berenice II (nos. 78, 79, 82, 87, 88 Austin/Bastianini).[68] Female members of the Spartan royal families are also known to have entered chariot teams in earlier days, Cynisca in 396 and 392 (who is now actually found cited as a distinguished precedent for Berenice Phernophoros in the new Posidippus, no. 87) and Euryleonis in 368.[69]

As to the latter, the religious sphere, Plutarch tells us that Bilistiche came to be worshipped by the Alexandrians in shrines and temples dedicated to Aphrodite Bilistiche:

> Was not Bilistiche, by Zeus, a barbarian female bought in the agora, she for whom the Alexandrians kept shrines and temples, on which the king, because of his love, inscribed the words 'of Aphrodite Bilistiche'? (Plutarch Moralia 753ef, *Eroticus*)

It has been presumed that she was deified by Philadelphus upon death (and therefore that she predeceased him, dying, accordingly, at some point prior to 246). Plutarch implies that the practice of worshipping her continued in his own day.[70] Clement tells that she was buried under the temple of Sarapis on the Racotis promontory after she had died at Canobus:

> When he had received the figure [a statue of Sarapis] Philadelphus set it up on the promontory they now call Rakotis, where the temple too of Sarapis is held in honour, and the place is adjacent to the tombs [?]. His concubine (παλλακίς) Bilistiche[71] died in Canopus but Ptolemy transferred (μεταγαγών) her here and buried her under the shrine just mentioned. (Clement of Alexandria *Protrepticus* 4.42)

The phraseology of the above passage suggests to me that Bilistiche had initially been buried at Canopus, and that her coffin was subsequently transferred to Rakotis.

It is highly likely that she exercised religious roles of the highest importance in life too. A Bilistiche, usually taken as identical with the royal mistress, served as the eponymous canephore of Arsinoe II

---

[68] Criscuolo 2003, Fantuzzi 2004, Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 27–30, 35 and 2004b and Stephens 2004.

[69] Moretti 1957 nos. 373, 381 and 418; cf. Cameron 1990:303 and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 28.

[70] Plutarch *Moralia* 753ef.

[71] The accusative form in the MSS is Βλιστιχίν.

in 251/0. Some, particularly in recent times, have doubted that the canephore is to be identified with the mistress.[72] The canephorate was perhaps the most exalted annual religious role for a woman in Alexandria.[73] Ptolemy IV Philopator's courtesan Agathocleia was subsequently to take on this same role in 213/12 (as we will discuss below).[74] This is particularly interesting because it is probable that, as at Athens, Alexandrian canephores were supposed to be virgins. Yet other evidence suggests that both Bilistiche and Agathocleia were established mistresses when they held the office. Bilistiche was presumably well into her mid 30's, if not over 40, in 251, since she had been winning races at Olympia since at least the early sixties. Agathocleia was presumably adult at any rate when canephore because she was already attested as owning ships in 215.[75]

Bilistiche interestingly constitutes the only example amongst all the known Hellenistic royal courtesans, some fifty in all,[76] laying claim to the Macedonian ethnic, and this in itself seems to set her apart.[77] The key evidence for her use of the ethnic derives ultimately from the relatively reassuring context of the Olympic victory lists. Thus Pausanias, discussing her 264 victory at Olympia with a pair of foals, asserts that she came from the coast of Macedonia.[78] We have noted Eusebius' seeming masculinising corruption of her name and ethnic to *Philistiakus* in his entry for the 264 victor with the pair of foals.[79] And again we depend on the ethnic Μακετίς in Phlegon's fragmentary Olympic Chronology, together with the apparent designation as courtesan, to identify Bilistiche as the woman named as victor with the four in 268.[80]

Her Macedonian ethnicity, or her claim to such, now seems to be further confirmed by her name, the proper form of which has long

---

[72] *P.CairZen.* ii 59289 and *P.Dem Zeno* 6b.; Ijsewijn 1961 no. 35. Cf. Fraser 1950:117 and 1972:ii 210 n. 206, Pomeroy 1984:57, Ogden 1999:262, Hazzard 2000:85 and Bennett 2005 s.*v.* 'Bilistiche'. The doubters are: Edgar 1920:99, Criscuolo 2003:319 and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 20 and 33. The last expresses doubt on the basis that Bilistiche the mistress would have been in her 30s at least by this point, not a young virgin of the sort that normally took on the role, but this is precisely to beg the question of whether a special exception could be made for such a woman.

[73] See Pomeroy 1984:55–59.

[74] *P.Grad.* 16 lines 1–3 etc.; Ijsewijn 1961 no. 74; cf. Pomeroy 1984:57.

[75] *P.Strasburg* i 562–563 and ii 113; see Hauben 1975 and Clarysse 1976.

[76] Catalogued at Ogden 1999:278–281.

[77] Cf. Ogden 1999:244–245.

[78] Pausanias 5.8.11.

[79] Eusebius *Chronicles* i 207 Schöne.

[80] Phlegon of Tralles (?) *Olympic chronology*, *FGH* 257a F6 = *P.Oxy.* 2082 lines 6–8.

been an object of contention.[81] It seems likely that 'Bilistiche' was the woman's given name, since it does not appear to have been typical of the names assumed by courtesans. Its orthography was disputed, with the manuscript traditions of some authors preserving variant forms: the manuscripts of Pausanias and Plutarch called her Belistiche,[82] those of the *Suda* Belestiche,[83] while those of Clement called her Blistichis[84] (not to mention the bizarre gender-crossing corruption of Eusebius, *Philistiakus*, i.e. [?] Φιλιστίαχος).[85] But the Athenaean spelling Bilistiche is now confirmed by a contemporary papyrus from the Zenon archive.[86] It is today generally accepted that the woman's name, in this form of Bilistiche, represents a Macedonian-dialect version of a Greek name.[87] The first element presumably relates to φιλ-, 'love'; Philip of Macedon after all famously knew himself as 'Bilippos';[88] and the Macedonian reflex of the Greek phi in beta is similarly found in other well-known Macedonian names, such as Berenice for Pherenice, 'Bringer of Victory.' It is just possible, then, that despite its corruption, Eusebius' account of her name *Philistiakus*, preserves a trace of an attempt to revert her name to its Attic or *koine* equivalent in the first syllable, Philistiche, a form actually found in a first-century BC inscription.[89] The most probabe full etymological account of her name accordingly construes it as the superlative stem φίλιστ- followed by the productive suffix -ίχα, found in a number of other female names, particularly in Boeotia (Doricha, Deinicha, Hippicha, etc.).[90]

Seldom brought into the debates about the origin of Bilistiche and her name is the fact that the Bilistiche who was canephore in 251 is given a patronymic in the Zenon papyrus that tells us this,

---

[81] See the discussion at Ogden 1999:251.

[82] Pausanias 5.8.11; Plutarch *Moralia* 753ef; cf. the 'Tyrian' Belistiche at *P.Hibeh* ii 261–262.

[83] *Suda s.v.* Σωτάδης.

[84] Clement *Protrepticus* 4.42.

[85] Eusebius *Chronicles* i 207 Schöne.

[86] Athenaeus 576ef (including Ptolemy VIII Physcon *FGH* 234 F4) and 596e; *P.CairZen.* ii 59289. Cf. Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 19.

[87] Thus Dindorf 1833 *s.v.*, Kalléris 1954–1976:ii 329–461, especially 366 with n. 2, and Masson 1985:110–112, Hatzopoulos 2000:102 n. 9, Tataki 1998:281 no. 32. The attempts of Pape and Benseler 1911 s.v. and Schneider 1913:1363 to relate the name to 'roll', seem desperate.

[88] Plutarch *Moralia* 292e. Masson 1985:110–111 also notes Macedonian 'Bilos' for 'Philos' and 'Bilis' for 'Philis'.

[89] Petrakos 1980:48 no. 60 = *SEG* 31.477; cf. Masson 1985:112.

[90] Cf. Masson 1985:112.

and her father's name is Philon.[91] It seems quite natural, given the conservatism of Greek naming conventions, that a father Philon might name his daughter Philistiche, although one might wonder why he is not calling himself 'Bilon'. The Philon in question is hard to identify since the name was a common one in the *Ptolemäerreich*. Kosmetatou has suggested that he should be identified with Philadelphus' admiral of this name who, Pliny tells us, brought topazes back from the Red Sea and gave them to his mother Berenice.[92] Two other daughters of Philon, both with good Greek names, served as canephore shortly before and after Bilistiche, Demonice in 257/6,[93] and Meniste in 248/7.[94] While we might be tempted to suppose that these were the daughters of the same, clearly very honoured Philon, as was Edgar, such a supposition raises difficulties of its own.[95] Bilistiche would have been a woman heading for middle age when she served. Were her sisters considerably younger than she was, or were they doing likewise? How, then, did they qualify for the role? Were they virgin though elderly, or were they themselves similarly courtesans of the king? Even if the canephore Bilistiche is a different one from the royal courtesan, the fact that we find a Bilistiche daughter of a Philon still constitutes an important indication that the names were cognate, or at any rate were perceived to be so.

Against the ostensibly sober representations of Bilistiche as Macedonian stands Plutarch's claim that she was barbarian and a market-bought slave.[96] If one were to take this seriously, one might suppose that, as a (former) slave of such origin she was given Macedonian citizenship for services rendered. The difficulty with this supposition is that there was no national citizenship of Macedon, only citizenship of its constituent cities, nor was the king she benefitted with her services in a position to bestow citizenship of Macedon or any of its cities in any meaningful way, although he might have thought he was. It is simpler to suppose that Plutarch's claim is in fact a piece of rhetorical colouring used in context to point up the incongruity of a courtesan being honoured with shrines and temples. If one looks for an origin for such a representation of Bilistiche, then it may perhaps have been found in Sotades' *On Bilistiche*, if that work was indeed a scurrilous attack upon

[91] *P.CairZen.* ii 59289; cf. Ogden 1999:246.
[92] Pliny *NH* 37.32; Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 22 and 33.
[93] *P.Hibeh* i. 95.
[94] *PSI* v. 521.
[95] Edgar 1919.
[96] Plutarch *Moralia* 753ef.

her. This connection is made by Kosmetatou in her 2004 article, at first tentatively, but by the end of the article it has acquired the status of established fact.[97]

Scholars have long pursued Plutarch's claim that she was a barbarian and associated it with her name's seemingly unstable orthography. In this way they were able to license imaginative reconstructions of both her supposedly actual name and her ethnicity: one theory made her an Iberian, comparing her name to that of Livy's Bilistages.[98] Another theory turned her into a Phoenician Baʿalyishthag. Wild as this hypothesis is, it seems to receive a superficial degree of support from two papyri of 239/8 (from a period, accordingly, after the death of our Bilistiche, the terminus ante for which is 246),[99] in which a possibly Tyrian Belistiche, daughter of someone whose name possibly begins with Mn-, makes loans at Oxyrhynchus.[100] This woman's Tyrian ethnicity is a little insecure, depending on the uncertainly restored Τυρία in *P.Hibeh* ii 261, in which the first letter remains dubious,[101] but perhaps invites us to read something related to Baal or Bel into the first element of the name. On the basis of these texts Kosmetatou has now suggested that the form Bilistiche consituted a semi-hellenisation or Macedonianisation of the Tyrian name for the purposes of social advancement as she approached the centre of power.[102] In response to the last one might wonder why courtesans might have believed their social advancement to be dependent in any way upon their names, and why, if so, she did not just take on an established Greek name.[103]

---

[97] Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 20, 'perhaps paraphrasing the jeering Εἰς Βελεστίχην by the ἰαμβόγραφος Sotades of Maroneia'; 22 'Plutarch's report according to which Bilistiche was nothing more than a lowly barbarian nobody is confusing, and there is little doubt that it probably originated in Sotades' derisive verses'; 30–31, 'The few lines that Plutarch paraphrases probably set the general tone of the text…' (here too it is suggested that the version of her name transmitted in Plutarch's MSS reflects a deliberately 'Tyrian' spelling of it by the abusive Sotades); 32, 'a cult of Aphrodite-Bilistiche was established already during her lifetime, as Sotades [i.e. Plutarch!] scornfully pointed out'.

[98] Livy 34.10; cf. Bevan 1927:77, citing a suggestion put to him personally by Petrie.

[99] I had accepted the identification with Bilistiche the mistress at Ogden 1999:238, but now judiciously withdraw it. Cf. also Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Bilistiche'.

[100] *P.Hibeh* ii 261–262. In 262 the surviving letters of the patronymic appear to be Μν …ίου.

[101] *P.Hibeh* ii. 262; in the Τυ]ρία of *P.Hibeh* ii 261all three surviving letters are dubious.

[102] Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 22–25, going far further than Masson 1985:110. The parallel she offers with Didyme is not exact: Didyme is (potentially) a translation of a native Egyptian name, not a hellenising remodelling of it.

[103] Cf. the well phrased objections of Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Bilistiche'.

Perhaps, rather the Tyrian father bore the famous courtesan in mind when he reformulated for his daughter a traditional Tyrian name in their new Graeco-Macedonian context.

But the ancient sources do explicitly offer Bilistiche a further ethnicity. Athenaeus, referring to some mysterious writers of Argive history,[104] says that she was Argive and derived her ancestry from the Atreidai:

> Bilistiche, the Argive courtesan was also of high repute, preserving the line of the Atreids, as the writers of *Argolica* relate. (Athenaeus 596e)

Kosmetatou's line of interpretation, we might note, sits peculiarly uncomfortably with such an emphatic statement that she actually preserved the line of the Atreids. Some sense can be made of this contradiction if we suppose that what was claimed for Bilistiche was Atreid or Argive descent rather than actual birth.[105] The former royal family of Macedon itself, the Argeads, also claimed to be descended from the Argive Perdiccas. Did Bilistiche therefore claim to be, or was it claimed on her behalf that she was, a scion of the Argead family? Cameron observes of such a claim that it would have been made naturally with no more justification than the Ptolemies.[106] A third ethnicity may be imputed to Bilistiche: Alexandrian. It is likely that, if she was indeed canephore, then she will have had, first, to have received the citizenship of this city.[107]

Bilistiche also received the attention of at least one poet. The *Suda* tells us that Sotades wrote an εἰς Βελεστίχην. We can not know for certain whether the piece was a graceful compliment to her or a scurrilous attack. The latter supposition might be favoured by the fact that the *Suda* has initially introduced Sotades as an iambographer before assigining this work to him.[108] It may also be favoured by the fact that Sotades is known to have abused Philadelphus' marriage to Arsinoe II with the famous line preserved by Athenaeus, "You are thrusting your stick into an unholy orifice" for which, Athenaeus tells us, Philadelphus had him dumped in the sea in a box.[109] Cameron suggests that, despite

---

[104] Gulick 1937 ad loc. guesses that Athenaeus might have in mind Dercylus, to whom he refers at 86f.

[105] This idea is the view adopted by Cameron 1990:302.

[106] Cameron 1990:30.

[107] Ogden 1999:246.

[108] *Suda* s.v. Σωτάδης, Κρής, Μαρωνείτης: '… the iambographer…' His writings included an On Bilistiche… Cf. Ogden 1999:235.

[109] Athenaeus 621a = Sotades F1 Powell. See also Kostas Buraselis' contribution in this volume.

Athenaeus' explicit linking of this line with Philadelphus' execution of Sotades, it may rather have been for his abuse of Bilistiche that he was in fact killed. He builds on the (unfounded) assumption that Sotades wrote the line on the occasion of Philadelphus' marriage in 275 and Launey's precarious argument that Sotades was not executed until 266, and so seeks a further offence on Sotades' part (which would admittedly coincide with Bilistiche's racing *floruit*).[110]

Cameron also argues hard that a dedicatory epigram ascribed to both Posidippus and Asclepiades in the Anthology refers to and mocks Bilistiche, and this view has recently been endorsed by Kosmetatou and Bennett.[111] Cameron reluctantly prefers the candidature of Posidippus, both because he is known to have been alive still in 263/2, and because of his own determination to associate the *floruit* of Asclepiades with the earlier part of Philadelphus' rein.[112] The decision is a grudging one for him, however, as he itches to ascribe the cleverness he finds for himself in the poem to his favoured Asclepiades. The Posidippus ascription has since been rejected by Bingen and Kosmetatou.[113] The poem reads as follows:

> Plangon dedicated this purple whip and these shining reins in the porch of fair horses (εὐίππων), after beating the very warlike Philaenis in riding-horse (κέλητι), just as the foals were beginning to neigh/get frisky in the evening (πώλων ἄρτι φρασσομένων). Dear Cypris, may you give me the unfailing glory of victory, and render my gift to you remembered forever. (Asclepiades/Posidippus Palatine Anthology 5.202 = Gow and Page 1965 Asclepiades no. xxxv)

On the face of it the poem is a simple variation of the type that follows it in the Anthology, ascribed to Asclepiades alone:

> Lysidice has dedicated to you, Cyprian, this riding spur, golden goad of her beautiful-ankled foot. With is she put many a supine horse through his paces. Her thigh was never reddened as she gently vibrated herself, for she always completed the course without the goad. Wherefore, she has hung the golden tool up for you in the middle gate. (Asclepiades Palatine Anthology 5.203 = Gow and Page 1965 Asclepiades no. vi)[114]

---

[110] So Launey 1945, Cameron 1990:300–301 and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 35.

[111] Cameron 1990:295–304; cf. Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 31–32 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Bilistiche'.

[112] Cameron 1990:291–295, 303–304.

[113] Bingen 2002:50 n. 6; Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 31.

[114] Cf. Cameron 1981:294–295.

Ostensibly both poems are literary fantasies that merely twist a dedication of the type that might be made by a victorious jockey to celebrate the prowess of a courtesan in the sexual position of squatting astride her supine lover. This is the position known in Greek by the term κέλης or 'riding horse' and in modern English by the term 'cowgirl'. But Cameron argues that the Plangon poem is in fact a rather more sophisticated and specific adaptation of poems like the Lysidice one, and that it is designed to allude to Bilistiche and her Olympic chariot-racing victories with colts or foals (πῶλοι) in 268 and 264. The case is as follows. First, the phrase 'just as the colts were beginning to neigh/get frisky' (πώλων ἄρτι φρασσομένων) seemingly remodels Callimachus' line 'just as the horses are beginning to neigh' (ἵππων ἄρτι φρυασσομέναν).[115] Posidippus has substituted 'colts' to reflect the fact that it was specifically in this category that Bilistiche won. Secondly, the poem constructs a sexual competition between women notorious for being courtesans, Plango of Miletus and Philaenis of Samos,[116] in order to evoke the courtesan-status of Bilistiche. Thirdly, Plango's whip, being purple, evokes a royal context.[117] Fourthly, the reference to the porch of fair horses evokes the temple Philadelphus dedicated to Bilistiche-Aphrodite.[118]

Objections to such a reading crowd in. The only point of any potential substance, to my mind, is the first one on the use of the word 'colts/foals' (πῶλοι), but this can be more than adequately explained both by a desire to vary the Callimachean model, if such it is, and by a desire to avoid jangling a ἵππων in line 4 with εὐίππων in line 2. And of course it is perfectly appropriate for the courtesan to boast her prowess above all with younger and more vigorous lovers. As for the other points, the purple of the third one was not exclusively associated with royalty, and seems an appropriate epithet for a whip that stands as an alternate to the golden spur of Lysidice, for whom no royal claim is made. These are both alike the luxury, non-functional toys of expensive courtesans. We can say nothing of the architecture or decoration of the Bilistiche-Aphrodite temple of the fourth point, as Cameron is

[115] Callimachus *Hymn* 5 line 2; cf. Cameron 1990:298.

[116] Cameron 1990:299. Plango is referred to by Athenaeus 558ab, 567ef and, in an protracted anecdote, at 594b—d; see below on Anaxilas. Philaenus is referred to at Aeschrion 1 and Dioscorides 26. See Gow and Page 1965:ii 140–141.

[117] Cameron 1990:299–300.

[118] Plutarch *Moralia* 753ef; Cameron 1990:300.

compelled to admit, whilst suggesting that it would have appropriately been decorated with horses given Bilistiche's equestrian achievements.

But the most difficult point for Cameron's case is surely the second one, that Bilistiche is evoked by the poem's subject matter of courtesans. One might have been able to concur more easily if the courtesan names were mere ciphers, but, in their pairing, they ostensibly denote well known established personalities within the courtesan tradition. So how are we to know that Plangon is to be read, at some level, as Bilistiche? Even if we could be sure that the poem alludes to a courtesan of Philadelphus, what would direct us to Bilistiche as opposed to any of the other ten? Indeed there is a sense in which Bilistiche is the most difficult of all Philadelphus' courtesans to read into Plangon, in the face of the latter's featured rivalry with Philaenis, because Bil-istiche/Phil-istiche's name actually corresponds rather with the rival's name in its initial syllable. And again, we must ask if Plangon can specifically be identified as Bilistiche, with whom are we to identify Philaenis? We are surely, in that case, invited to identify her with someone. We should also note that the association of the famous Plangon with a riding metaphor makes sense in itself in terms of her tradition. A fragment of Anaxilas refers to a knight, a ἱππεύς, of hers who stripped her of all her worldly possessions, dragging her furniture away with him. Gow and Page note that the term ἱππεύς here may well have had an 'equivocal' meaning.[119]

And then there is the difficulty of the poem's tone and purpose. For Cameron the poem, with its scurrilous subject matter, is a scurrilous attack: the association of the king's mistress with a crude sexual position, and boasts about he same, can only have one import. If so, one may ask, then how did the author get away with writing it? Cameron again refers to the precarious case he has made for Sotades: if there was a nine year gap between Sotades' crude line on the marriage of Philadelphus to Arsinoe II and his execution, then perhaps one could get away, for a time at any rate, with such poems.[120] But such a reading to my mind sits awkwardly with the graceful address to Aphrodite in the final couplet, which tends to win the listener for the dedicator. Admittedly, however, complexity of tone, discontinuity of tone and ambivalence of attitude and purpose are the common rights of all poetry, and ones exercised by Hellenistic poetry not least. And now, since the discovery of the new Posidippus collection, with its numer-

[119] Anaxilas F22 lines 8–10 K-A = Athenaeus 558b; Gow and Page 1965:ii 140–141.
[120] Cameron 1990:300–301.

ous graceful complements to the women of the royal family, I would venture to suggest that such an attack just does not look like this poet.

But now Bilistiche has had more than a scurrilous poem foisted on her. She has also been given, initially by Buraselis and most recently by Ravazzolo and Bennett, a husband, Andromachus, and a child fathered by Philadelphus, one Ptolemy Andromachou, to be identified with Ptolemy of Ephesus.[121] These attributions are, it should be stated categorically, without any secure foundation.[122] The case, such as it is, is as follows. Athenaeus mentions a Ptolemy, son of Philadelphus, killed at Ephesus with his concubine, the man who has accordingly come to be known Ptolemy of Ephesus.[123] A fragmentary Copenhagen papyrus seems to have been occupied by a series of potted biographies of minor members of the Ptolemaic family, including Magas, the son of Ptolemy III. The first fragment seems to read as follows:

[Ptolem]y [ca]lled of Andromachus (-ἰκλησιν Ἀνδρομάχου)

	Ptolem(y) called of	this [?]…
	Andromachus (Πτολεμαῖ°	and…
	ἐπίκλησιν Ἀνδρομάχου)	and…
		captures Ainos and many…
		and having fought a sea-
…him…		battle… Andros [?]…
		overwhelmed in faction
		by… he was cut down in
		Ephesus… hatch[ing] a plot…

(*P.Haunienses* 6 lines 1–13)[124]

Since this Ptolemy was apparently killed at Ephesus he is likely to be the same as the man mentioned by Athenaeus. The death may have occurred shortly after 246, when the capture of Ainos place.[125] The abbreviated phrase used by the papyrus to describe the Ptolemy in question in what appears to constitute a section title, Πτολεμαῖ°

[121] Buraselis 1982:124–141, esp. 133, Ravazzolo 1996:132 and 131 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Bilistiche' and 'Ptolemy Andromachou'. Parts of Bennett's case can be found also in Fraser 1950, Huss 1998 and Tunny 2000.

[122] Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 23 appropriately comments on Bennett's case, 'In my opinion there is not a shred of evidence to support this elaborate reconstruction of events.'

[123] Athenaeus 593ab.

[124] The text is conveniently reproduced at Huss 1998:235.

[125] Huss 1988:235, 242.

ἐπίκλησιν Ἀνδρομάχου, means to tell us that the man was in some way passed off as the son of Andromachus, even though he was in fact sired by Philadelphus. Bilistiche is to be identified as the mother of Ptolemy Andromachou because she is Philadelphus' best attested courtesan, and because she was canephore in 251/0, the same year in which a Ptolemy, son of Andromachus (without further qualification), was eponymous priest.[126]

Again, the objections vie for attention. I will not waste time on the potentially spoiling theory that the text refers not to a Ptolemy called 'son of Andromachus', but to a Ptolemy 'surnamed Andromachus', with 'Andromachou' as a personal epithet of a 'Ptolemy' in the genitive, even though the theory is not as risible as it may initially appear. But it is ultimately too much to be asked to believe that this Ptolemy should have taken on Andromachus as a surname, whilst another Ptolemy, the eponymous priest of 251/0, evidently did bear the genitive Andromachou as a patronymic.[127]

So to the first objection proper. One is putting an awful lot of weight on a whimsical interpretation of ἐπίκλησιν to deprive 'Ptolemy called the son of Andromachus' of the paternity he claimed. Huss notes that such a usage cannot be directly paralleled.[128] If we are to think that special emphasis does attach to the term ἐπίκλησιν, what does such emphasis signify? Does it mean that he was known to be someone else's son, and had been adopted by Andromachus? Or does it mean that he was given out as the son of Andromachus, but that he was suspected of having been sired by another, perhaps in an adulterous liaison with the wife of Andromachus? The fact that the papyrus apparently refers to the man twice in quick succession with this phrase, first, apparently

[126] *P.CairZen.* ii 59289 and *P.Dem. Zeno* 6b. Cf. Fraser 1950:116.

[127] The point is elegantly made by Fraser 1950:118. See discussion also at Momigliano 1950:112–113 (building on a suggestion by Maas), Huss 1988:244–245 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Ptolemy Andromachou'. Such a surname might be interpreted, in what might be considered decreasing order of probability, as: first, a secondary name; secondly, an epithet to be construed 'Fighter of Men'; and thirdly, an epithet to be construed 'Fighter in Andros', on the partial model of Aristophanes' famous term Μαραθωνομάχης (*Acharnians* 181). But the last appears to be lent a greater degree of plausibility by the fact that the Copenhagen papyrus appears to speak of him fighting in Andros: ναυμαχήσας … Ἄνδρον. The battle of Andros is usually presumed to have taken place in ca. 245–244. In this case the papyrus might well yet refer to Ptolemy of Ephesus, but detach him completely from any man called Andromachus. In such a Ptolemy-rich environment as mid third-century Alexandria, it is hardly surprising that Ptolemies, whatever their origin, felt the need of extra defining epithets.

[128] As noted by Momigliano 1950:109 and Huss 1998:243–244.

by way of a title section and then, apparently, in a marginal marker between two columns of narrative text,[129] seems to suggest that the phrase is not being used to make a dark dig at parentage at the point of his introduction, but that it is being used as an established defining phrase (such things being particularly useful, of course, in the context of a plethora of Ptolemies). An Andromachus who may well have been the father in question is identified as the father of the Berenice who was canephore in 268/7, and he may have had a village named after him.[130] If one supported this general hypothesis of Bilistiche being Ptolemy Andromachou's mother, then one might then wonder whether this Berenice, the earliest datable canephore, was the daughter of Bilistiche, but Bennett thinks this unlikely, since it would imply that she was already old enough to be the mother of a near-adult daughter at what is presumed to be her high period with Philadelphus.

Secondly, death at Ephesus need not in itself identify Ptolemy of Ephesus with Ptolemy Andromachou: both Ptolemies could have died there by coincidence. In this case, we would have no reason to suppose that Philadelphus had anything to do with Ptolemy Andromachou, whatever the reason for the application of the term ἐπίκλησιν to him.

Thirdly, even if Ptolemy Andromachou is the son of Philadelphus, we have no means whatsoever of divining who is mother was, be she queen or courtesan.[131]

Fourthly, the greatest objection to this hypothesis is the fundamental implausibility of the chain of actions implied. Why would Philadelphus have a son by a courtesan adopted by another man? Hellenistic kings in general did, admittedly, have difficulties in managing their large and centrifugal families, sired from many polygamously held and viciously competitive wives, but even in this context the notion of a king having one of his own sons adopted by another person, and in this case apparently a person of at best middling eminence, is simply unheard of. For Fraser, writing in 1950, Philadelphus' purpose was to bestow respectability upon his child. It seems very dubious that such a concept is relevant.[132]

---

[129] Thus Momigliano 1950:109.

[130] *PSI* vi 639, *P.Col.Zen.* ii 114j = *P.Zen.Pestman* 38, *P.Sorb.* 2440. Cf. Van 't Dack 1961 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Ptolemy Andromachou'.

[131] Thus Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 23, and as conceded by Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Ptolemy Andromachou'.

[132] Fraser 1950.

There have, inevitably, been attempts to identify Ptolemy Andromachou with other of the stray Ptolemy-lets that haunt the prosopography of Philadelphus' reign, who include Ptolemy the Son (Ptolemy Nios), Ptolemy son of Lysimachus (his son by Arsinoe II), Ptolemy of Ephesus and Ptolemy of Telmessus.[133] Ravazzolo attempted to identify him with the problematic Ptolemy the Son, who is indeed usually identified with Ptolemy of Ephesus.[134] More recently Huss has attempted to identify him both with Ptolemy the Son and with Ptolemy son of Lysimachus, who in turn is usually identified with Ptolemy of Telmessus. For Huss Ptolemy son of Lysimachus fled to Egypt to join his mother, who prevailed upon Philadelphus to adopt him and to bestow a co-regency upon him. His incentive for such a curious move, which seemingly dispossessed his blood sons, was to lay can indirect claim to the throne of Macedon, which had been Lysimachus'.[135] Marc Domingo Gygax has attempted to argue that Ptolemy the Son and Ptolemy Andromachou were illegitimate full brothers.[136]

Sister-marriage and the Courtesans

Why should Bilistiche have been given, or allowed to develop, such a high-profile role? No explanation may be needed beyond the king's favour. This seems to be the best explanation for the magnificent role that Lamia was able to enjoy under Demetrius Poliorcetes, although I note that we do know for sure that Lamia did bear her king a child, Phila, that was raised as his.[137]

I offer a tentative hypothesis. My starting point is the coincidence that Bilistiche shares, probably, her peculiar prominence and in one respect her particular honours, with Agathocleia, the notorious courte-

[133] Huss 1998:237 n. 34 provides a most helpful table to chart the various identifications and differentiations made between the various Ptolemy-lets by older scholars. The most traditional view has been that 'Ptolemy the Son' was an older full brother of Ptolemy III, born, accordingly, of Philadelphus and Arsinoe I. This was the view I adopted at Ogden 1999:79–80, and it has now been reasserted by Tunny 2000. Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Ptolemy Nios' identifies Ptolemy the Son with Ptolemy son of Lysimachus. Buraselis (forthcoming) now reasserts the case for identifying Ptolemy the Son with Ptolemy III.

[134] Ravazzolo 1996.

[135] Huss 1998:237–248; the case is critiqued by Tunny 2000:86–90.

[136] Domingo Gygax 2002, building on Crampa 1969:120.

[137] Athenaeus 577c; cf. Ogden 1999:176–177 and Wheatley 2003:34–35.

san, specifically a *psaltria* according to Jerome, of Ptolemy IV Philopator, whom Strabo actually defines by shorthand as 'he of Agathocleia.' Our evidence for Agathocleia and her antics,[138] alongside those of her brother Agathocles and her mother Oenanthe,[139] is of a richness and colour sadly lacking in Bilistiche's case.[140] Polybius and Justin recount at some length how the three formed a debauched court clique who between them enslaved the weak-willed Philopator, subverted the entire kingdom and murdered his sister-wife Arsinoe III before being stripped and torn apart by the Alexandrian mob. Justin further tells how the women appeared in public, attended by a retinue, to receive salutations, and that the women initially concealed Philopator's death so that they could plunder the treasury. The particular point of contact between Bilistiche and Agathocleia is, as mentioned, the canephorate, which an Agathocleia described as the daughter of a Theogenes, Diognetos or Theognetos, undertook in 213/12.[141] The family may have been a complex one, because Agathocleia's brother Agathocles is said to have been the son of another Agathocles.[142] Maas contended that Oenanthe had married twice.[143] Pomeroy noted the perversity of hypothesising that woman named Agathocleia should have been born to a Theogenes (etc.) rather than to an Agathocles.[144] But Bennett now proposes that Diognetos was a second husband who adopted the daughter of the first.[145] The other characteristic Bilistiche and Agathocleia shared was that they were the courtesans of the first two Ptolemies to marry their full sisters. Both courtesans might, it seems to me, have had an important role to play in sweetening the institution of sister-marriage for the court's Graeco-Macedonian consumers.

Philadelphus' marriage to Arsinoe II was childless, almost inevitably so given that she was around 40 at its inception, and perhaps too it

---

138 *PP* no. 14714.

139 *PP* no. 14731.

140 Polybius 14.11, 15.25–33; Strabo C795; Plutarch *Cleomenes* 33 and *Moralia* 735d (*Eroticus*); Justin 30.1–2 and Trogus *Prologue* 30; Athenaeus 576f.–577a (apparently derivative of Polybius); John of Antioch *FHG* iv p. 558 F54; Jerome/Hieronymus *In Danielem* 11.13–14 = *FGH* 260 F45; Scholiast Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 1059; *P.Hauniense*s i 6 F6–7 line 3; *P.Strasburg* i 562, 563 and ii 113(at Clarysse 1976); Ijsewijn 1961 no. 71.

141 *P.Grad.* 16 and *P.Hauswaldt* 18a; cf. Ogden 1999:246 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Agathocleia'.

142 *BGU* vi 1262.

143 Maas 1946.

144 Pomeroy 1984:49–50 and 186 n. 49.

145 Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Agathocleia'.

was sexless, but whether it was or not, it would perhaps have seemed advisable to Philadelphus to give out the message that, whilst he may have been having sex with Arsinoe for business purposes, he wasn't having it with her for fun, at any rate. What was, or seemed to be, good policy for the dynasty, may have been felt to be potentially disastrous for the moral perception of the king as an individual. The bind is neatly expressed by the best known poetic commentaries upon the sister-marriage. Plutarch refers in passing to a nameless rhapsode who sung the line from the *Iliad* 'Zeus called Hera his sister and his wife' at the marriage of Philadelphus to his sister, to defuse the revulsion.[146] Theocritus too compared the marriage to that between Zeus and Hera in his *Encomium of Ptolemy*.[147] A fragmentary poem in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* may have made a similar point: it seems to mention Hera, Arsinoe and weddings. Such comparisons received a visual counterpart in the monument set up by the Samian admiral Callicrates at Olympia, which consisted of colossal statues of Ptolemy and Arsinoe II facing the temples of Zeus and Hera.[148] On the other side of the debate, Sotades told Philadelphus that he was "thrust(ing) his stick into an unholy orifice" (εἰς οὐχ ὁσίην τρυμαλιὴν τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς).[149] Some believe that Sotades' poem is alluded to in the large Callimachean fragment on Acontius and Cydippe, where the poet makes a show of checking himself from speaking, apparently, about the marriage of Zeus and Hera, and calls himself a shameless dog for venturing to sing of something unholy (οὐχ ὁσίη).[150] Perhaps this was why Philadelphus found it advisable to give a high and semi-formalised role to a courtesan. Perhaps too that was why, in a complementary strategy, he took on such a substantial number of courtesans more generally (again, he is associated with far more than any other Hellenistic king).[151] In this regard, Sotades' abuse of Arsinoe II and his abuse of Bilistiche, if abuse her he did, may have been closely related: Bilistiche could have been seen as part of the same sister-marrying project.

---

[146] Plutarch *Moralia* 736f.; Homer *Iliad* 18.356.

[147] Theocritus 17.131–134; cf. Gow 1952 and Hunter 2003 *ad loc.*; cf. also Hazzard 2000: 89–90.

[148] See Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 24 and 'Legitimacy', 234.

[149] Sotades F1 Powell (at Athenaeus 621a and Plutarch *Moralia* 11a); cf. Ogden 1999:79.

[150] Callimachus F75 lines 4–5; cf. Pretagostini 1984:144–147, Cameron 1995:18–22, Hunter 2003:193.

[151] Ogden 1999:221–222.

Now, on the hypothesis advanced, it makes more sense for Bilistiche to have first come to her prominence prior to the death of Arsinoe. However, Cameron and Kosmetatou have contended that Bilistiche was only brought to prominence after the death of Arsinoe II.[152] The date of the death of Arsinoe is one of the most contentious dates in Ptolemaic dynastic history, with the options falling between 270[153] and 268.[154] Cameron favours 268, and on the calculations he himself uses, Bilistiche's 268 victory will have followed Arsinoe's death by as little as two months. But even if we accept the 270 date for Arsinoe's death, the chronologically-based evidence for Bilistiche is so vestigial, and even on the most optimistic estimate confined to the records of her 268 and 264 chariot victories and her 251 canephorate, that we have no serious grounds whatsover for confining her prominence to the period after Arsinoe's death.

Ptolemy III Euergetes I could not follow the precedent of full-sister marriage even if he had wanted to, for his one and only full sister, Berenice Phernophorus, had been married off by Philadelphus to Antiochus II in 255 or 253.[155] This famous and provisionally successful act of dynastic destabilisation resulted in her murder in 246, shortly after Ptolemy III's accession. All that was left for Ptolemy III was a marriage to his half-cousin Berenice II that was untroubling to Greek sensibilities about incest, and he seems to have made this marriage close to the point of his accession in 246.[156] Accordingly, he had no need to flaunt his courtesans in public. It is potentially inferable that he may have kept Oenanthe, the mother of Agathocleia, as a courtesan, but she only comes to prominence alongside her daughter in the rein of Philopator.[157]

But when Philopator came to marry his full sister Arsinoe III and indeed proceeded to sire Ptolemy V Epiphanes from her, the first actual sister-born Ptolemy, he perhaps felt that he similarly had to give out the message that any sex he had with his sister was strictly for the business of siring, and sought to do this by flaunting a high-

[152] Cameron 1990:301–302 and Kosmetatou, Bilistiche, 34–35.

[153] Thus Minas 1994, Cadell 1998, and Kosmetatou, 'Bilistiche', 34.

[154] Thus Grzybek 1990:107–112, Cameron 1990:301–302 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Arsinoe II'.

[155] Porphyry *FGHist* 260 F43 = Jerome *In Danielem* 11.6a; cf. Ogden 1999:127–132.

[156] Justin 26.3.2–8; cf. Ogden 1999:80–81 and Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Berenice II'.

[157] This is the inference of Walbank 1957–1989 on Polybius 14.11 and Hauben 1975:290; cf. Ogden 1999:242.

profile courtesan before the populace. The extent of the prominence accorded Agathocleia may perhaps be judged by Polybius' remark that Arsinoe III had to live with insulting and disgraceful behaviour all her life.[158]

Here I turn again to Polybius' account of the mob killing of Agathocleia, during which, we are told, she exposed her breasts to the mob, and claimed that she had suckled Ptolemy V with them.[159] Perhaps this is, still, to be seen as no more than a piece of rhetorical, melodramatic hokum, but could there be anything to a claim that she had nursed Ptolemy V, which Polybius does not explicitly undermine? If it were true, or were, so far as the mob was concerned, potentially true, then it would mean that Agathocleia had herself been delivered of a child, presumably not so far from the time at which Ptolemy V was born. Such a child, if male, may perhaps be mentioned in *P.Haunienses* 6.[160] Who might the father have been? Philopator is the only candidate to whom we can point in the condition of our data. Bennett has recently, and perhaps playfully, offered what might be seen as a Gordian-knot solution, namely that it was Agathocleia herself and not Arsinoe III that was the birth-mother of Ptolemy V.[161] This would mean, of course, that Ptolemy V was not after all the first known sister-born Ptolemy, and this distinction would then pass to the children of Ptolemy VI and his full sister Cleopatra II (i.e. Ptolemy Eupator, Ptolemy VII Neos Philopator, perhaps a further, unnamed son, Cleopatra Thea and Cleopatra III).[162] But, on the assumption that Ptolemy V was indeed the sister-born son of Philopator and Arsinoe III, might Philopator even have gone to the extent of presenting Agathocleia as his sister-born son's wet-nurse (whether or not she did take on this role) as a further, albeit indirect, means of mitigating the act of incest?

Like Bilistiche too, apparently, Agathocleia was subject to abuse in her turn. Polybius preserves the insults levelled at her and the rest of her family by Tlepolemus: she and her mother were dismissed as sambuca-player and hairdresser, and Agathocles as a former catamite of the king's.[163] Again, do these women attract abuse precisely because their role is to make the indecent relatively more decent? Agatho-

158 Polybius 15.25; cf. Ogden 1999:81.
159 Polybius 15.31; cf. Ogden 1999:81–82.
160 *P.Haunienses* F6–7 line 6.
161 Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Possible child of Ptolemy IV'.
162 See Ogden 1999:83–87.
163 Polybius 15.25.

cleia need not have been chosen lightly for such a role. She could have been provided it for it by a family specalised in providing courtesans to the Ptolemies. Her notorious mother, Oenanthe, is also said to have been Philopator's courtesan,[164] and she may also, for chronological reasons, have been Euergetes' courtesan before that.[165] If the Agathocleia attributed to Philadelphus himself as a courtesan is not a ghost of Philopator's Agathocleia in the tradition, then she may well have belonged to the same family. One begins to understand why Agathocles, brother of Philopator's Agathocleia, may have been represented as the beloved of Philopator too.

So what happens in the next generation of sister-marriage, when the full brothers Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII both marry in turn their full sister Cleopatra II? The slight evidence for courtesans in this generation, the last, as it happens, for whom we have any named courtesans, might suggest that the custom of hiding-behind-the-courtesan was in its final phase. No courtesans are known for Ptolemy VI, but Josephus and Diodorus tell us of one belonging to Ptolemy VIII:

> After this Ptolemy saw a terrible vision that prevented him from harming the people [the Jews]. Moreover, his dearest concubine, whom some name as Ithaca, others as Hirene [i.e. Eirene] supplicated him not to commit such a great act of impiety. He conceded to her and repented of the things he had done and the things he had been planning to do (Josephus *Against Apion* 2.5).[166]
>
> As he was celebrating the festival for the birth [of his son Memphites], displaying his customary bloody cruelty, he ordered the execution of the Cyreneans that had escorted him back to Egypt, who were now under indictment on account of his concubine Eirene, because they had made free, albeit fair, comments (Look in the book *On marriages*) (Diodorus 33.13).
>
> Whilst these things were being done, his [Ptolemy IX Lathyrus'] brother [Ptolemy Apion], begotten from a concubine, to whom their father had left the kingdom of Cyrene in his will, died leaving the Roman people his heir (Justin 39.5.2).

It is not clear whether Eirene or Ithaca or another woman again was the mother of Ptolemy Apion. I see no strong reason not to take Josephus at face value and to hold that Eirene and Ithaca were one

---

[164] Polybius 14.11.1 (at Athenaeus 251c).15.25.12, 15.29.8–14 and 15.33.8; Plutarch *Cleomenes* 33 and *Moralia* 753d (*Eroticus*) and Justin 30.2.3.

[165] Walbank 1957–1989 on Polybius 14.11 and Hauben 1975:290; cf. Ogden 1999:242.

[166] This part of the text is preserved only in the Latin translation of Cassiodorus.

and the same woman, although Bennett has recently differentiated them on the basis of a precarious chronological argument.[167] The important point is that Eirene was clearly an influential person in Physcon's life and that she was by his side at a time soon after his 145 coronation and his sister-marriage to Cleopatra II, when her she would have been most desirable for propaganda purposes, according to the hypothesis advanced here. Again we might wonder whether Eirene attracted abuse, like Bilistiche and Agathocleia, and particularly at this point, because of her supposed role in deflecting moral opprobrium from the sister marriage.[168] The note inserted by Diodorus' excerptor, "Look in the book *On marriages*", refers the reader on to another Constantinian collection, now lost. What might we have found there? The suggestion that Physcon married Eirene? Or perhaps discussion of the role that Eirene played in the context of Physcon's incestuous marriage to Cleopatra II?

[167] Bennett 2005 *s.vv.* 'Eirene' and 'Ithaca.' He argues that the events Josephus describes as taking place in 145 would make better sense in the context of his recovery of Alexandria from Cleopatra II in 127.

[168] Justin 39.5.2. The objections of Bennett 2005 *s.v.* 'Ptolemy Apion' to this possibility seem groundless.

THE GOD SERAPIS, HIS CULT AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE RULER CULT IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT*

Stefan Pfeiffer

When Egypt became the kingdom of the Ptolemies, they found a thousand-year-old culture with a flourishing religiosity focused on the Pharaoh. In order to establish a stable power base in the country, the foreign rulers had to respond to the needs of their Egyptian subjects, who made up most of the population of their kingdom. For their official public image, the Ptolemies therefore assumed not only the Hellenistic portrayal of a *basileus*, but they also became Egyptian Pharaohs. On the bas-reliefs in Egyptian temples, the Ptolemaic kings are depicted during sacrifices to the Egyptian gods as native Pharaohs.

The obvious appropriation of pharaonic tradition occurred, on the one hand, because of the basic necessity of adapting to the native environment; on the other hand, the prerogatives and modes of public display accompanying the office of the Pharaoh seem to have held a great attraction for the foreign ruler. The two colossal statues, about 40 ft/12 m high, found during underwater excavations at Qait-Bey, Alexandria, and said to be Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, demonstrate how much, for example, the royal couple were concerned with an identification with Egypt and especially with the Egyptian kingship.[1] Ptolemy is depicted here as Pharaoh, his consort as Isis, both at the main entry harbour to Egypt. The first thing that foreigners saw of the ruler upon landing in Egypt was thus his depiction as the Egyptian Pharaoh. Accordingly, Ptolemy II placed a strong accent

* The present article was written as a part of the project segment A 1 "Creation and Development of a Multi-Cultural Society in Graeco-Roman Egypt" in the SFB project 600 sponsored by the German Research Association (DFG) "Foreigners and the Poor: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day" at the University of Trier. I am most grateful to Frankie Kann for the English translation; for the discussion, I am grateful to the research centre Graeco-Roman Egypt in Trier. The abbreviations of the quoted papyri can be found in "The 5th Edition of the Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets" at http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html.

[1] Veïsse (2004), 193; Corteggiani (1998), 103; Empereur (1998), 76–77.

on the Egyptian perception of his rule, not only for his Egyptian subjects but also for the Hellenistic *oikumene*, Hellenistic Greek for 'the inhabited part of the world'. The Greeks and Macedonians who came to Egypt also seemed to have been quite impressed with the Egyptian religion and its universe of deities. Baines, for example, has recently demonstrated that, within the country's administrative elite, there was very quickly no distinction according to ethnic classification, because the inhabitants liked to switch between cultures and religions.[2] In addition, the immigrants were given the opportunity through the *interpretatio Graeca* of viewing their popular Greek gods in equivalents to the Egyptian gods. Thus, Zeus was the Egyptian Amun, Aphrodite the Egyptian Isis. The cult of the Graeco-Egyptian god Serapis, created by Ptolemy I or at least strongly promoted by the dynasty, became of great importance for the leadership elite of the kingdom and their identification with it.[3] In the second generation, the Ptolemies took a second approach to bind the subjects to them and to the kingdom: Ptolemy II introduced an official ruler cult. In the course of Ptolemaic propaganda, and based on Greek ideas, the monarch developed into a god king, who together with his consort was accorded a divine cult. Ptolemy II did thus not in any way stop at the religious expression of the Egyptian cult of the Pharaoh—before Ptolemy II, the Pharaoh was never a god; only his office was divine; the traditional Pharaoh himself never became the object of a deity cult.

In this chapter, the god Serapis and his importance for the Hellenistic ruler cult are to be an example of how the newly created official ruler cult was linked to the Serapis cult from the previous generation in order to offer the subjects of various ethnic origins a common focus for their religiosity. This close connection of the Serapis and the ruler cult has already been noted in various places in research,[4] but nowhere has a connection between both phenomena been investigated. However, before we can make a connection between the ruler cult and the Serapis cult, we need to look in the following at the deity Serapis himself, his origins and his cult.

---

[2] Baines (2004), 33–61.

[3] Basic information: Huss (1994), 58–68; cf. Fraser (1960), 2, n. 1.

[4] Bommas (2005), 44; Brady (1978), 22–23; Fraser (1960), 18 and 24; Fraser (1972), I, 227; 263; Grimm (1983), 73; Hölbl (1994), 94; Hölbl (1993), 25.

The Pharaoh and the Apis Bull

From time immemorial, in Memphis, the old capital of the Pharaonic kingdom, the living Apis bull along with Ptah was accorded special veneration. Since the period of the Old Kingdom, the cult of the bull thrived in an extremely close religious relationship to the Egyptian Pharaoh.[5] According to Kessler, the Apis led "to the merging of the king with the transregional king-father-god, the creator god Ptah".[6] With the words of Hölbl, we may state that the king as bearer of the divine office was theologically related to the Memphite Apis, when it played a significant role during "the royal calendar and coronation festivals and, as city god on the king's standard, protected him at his enthronement."[7] Thus the Apis was a royal god to the fullest extent.

The first and most important act conducted by Alexander the Great after the 'liberation' of Egypt from foreign Persian rule was to sacrifice to the bull: "Thence he crossed the river and went to Memphis, where he sacrificed to the gods especially Apis, and held athletic and musical games."[8] For the first time, we find Egyptian divinity cult united with Greek cult elements—which is how we must view the games. Not only Alexander the Great worshipped Apis, but the Ptolemies especially were to become aware of the legitimising significance of Apis for their power.[9] Thus they also made particular use of the deceased Apis, that is, the Osiris-Apis. According to Diodorus for example (I 84.8), Ptolemy I donated 50 silver talents to its burial.[10]

Osiris-Apis, Osiris and Serapis

When it died, every Apis bull was transformed into the deity Osiris-Apis.[11] This deity had already been worshipped under the name Osorapis by the Greeks living in Memphis, the so-called Hellenomemphites

---

[5] Thompson (1988), 199–207; Kessler (1989). See also Steve Vinson's contribution in this volume.

[6] Kessler (1989), 74.

[7] Hölbl (1994), 73.

[8] Arrianus, Anabasis III, 1,3–4; see Hölbl (1994), 9.

[9] See Assmann (1996), 414–415.

[10] Thompson (1988), 212–265; Crawford (1980), 12–15.

[11] For the different connections between Osiris and Apis, see Kessler (2000), 163, 172–188, who, unfortunately, cites no sources that can confirm his thoughts; cf. also the remarks by Schmidt (2005), 292.

of the pre-Hellenistic era.[12] Ptolemy I and his advisory staff probably then subjected the Osiris-Apis to a partial *interpretatio Graeca*. The specifically Memphite deity was, however, not given the name of any of the known Greek deities (such as Zeus), but Osiris-Apis received the name Serapis.[13] We see the deity for the first time with this name in the sources since the reign of Ptolemy I.[14] With the appellation Serapis, the god Osiris-Apis bore a Graecised Egyptian name, which was phonetically still recognisable as an originally Egyptian name for this deity.[15] The new name Serapis was in all likelihood promoted by the rulers, for only in this way can the spread of the form Serapis and not in the form Osorapis be explained throughout the *oikumene*.[16]

Yet the bilingual temple dedication plaques of the Serapieion in Alexandria document the equation of Osiris-Apis with Serapis.[17] Moreover, the cult temple of Osiris-Apis in Memphis is described in the papyri as Serapieion, that is, as Temple of Serapis.[18] Naturally, the Serapis of Alexandria displayed other local characteristics than those of Serapis of Memphis or, for example, of Kanopos,[19] a peculiarity inher-

[12] Hölbl (1994), 93.

[13] Swiderek (1975), 674, based on Wilcken *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, 86–87. Bommas (2005), 25, thinks that the creation of the god can be traced to the Hellenomemphites living in Memphis, which is also possible.

[14] The oldest documentation for the god Serapis is a fragment from the writings of Menander (Körte, fr. 139), who died in 291 BC, cf. Fraser (1960), 2, n. 1; Weinreich (1931), 13–15; Vidman (1970), 31.

[15] Despite doubts in the research, I think Mussies' explanation is quite possible: that the initial sound O in the name OSerapis was felt to be the vocative case by the creators of Serapis (Mussies [1978]); Bommas is of the opinion that the O (*W*) in Osiris (*Wsjr*) could not drop out, that the name Serapis thus could not be a short form for OSerapis at all. However, the Egyptian personal name *Weser-maat-Ra*, which can be rendered in the Greek as *Zmanre*, shows that this is at least possible (Lüddeckens and Thissen [2000], 128 and 134). Bommas (2005), 25, in contrast, believes that the name Serapis should be understood etymologically as the translation of the expression "Apis proclaims (the oracle)" (*ser Apis*)–documentation, however, does not yet exist. Another possible but also controversial view is that the Greeks took the O to be an article, this was most recently the opinion of Quack (2001), see, however, the contrasting opinion of Wilcken *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, 86.

[16] In this case, Wilcken *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, 87, seems the most convincing to me.

[17] Cf. Tod (1942); Grimm (1998), 84–85; see also the Roman Demotic-Greek dedication to Serapis: Vleeming (2001), No. 260, and the notice of the "great temple of Osiris-Apis which is in Rhakotis": Ray (1976), No. 3, verso 18–20.

[18] Borgeaud and Volokhine (2000), 71–72; Bommas is of a different opinion (2005), 24.

[19] Cf. most recently Kiss (2004).

ent in most Egyptian deities. That also explains why the deity retained the old name Osorapis especially in the Memphite Serapieion, there where the cult of the deceased Apis bull held pride of place.[20]

A 'simple' *interpretatio Graeca* of the Egyptian god, that is, equating it with a Greek deity, was not possible, however, and most certainly was not what the founder of the cult in Alexandria, Ptolemy I, wanted. For Serapis, established as the kingdom's god,[21] was to unite in its nature many more basic functions than any other Greek deity could offer. Among these were its specifically Egyptian features: presumably primarily the success and good fortune guaranteed by the Apis and perhaps also the possible convergence of the king with Ptah accomplished in completion of the ritual during the feast. Serapis could also have assumed from Apis the task as oracle deity.[22] In addition, however, power over the underworld and the guarantee of fertility for the land embodied by the pan-Egyptian God Osiris were of unusual significance.

Despite the emphasis on the Apis aspect in the name, the Osiris element of the deity in public and private *perception* of the cult clearly played the leading role.[23] For Egyptians, Serapis was often nothing other than an *interpretatio Graeca* of Osiris. Thus they were able to render the Greek personal name Sarapion in the Egyptian form with 'The son of Osiris'.[24] How close Osiris and Serapis were in the Egyptian imagination can be demonstrated as well by a bilingual dedication. In Greek, the inscription reads: "To Serapis, the great god, Paniskos, son of Sarapion." The Demotic 'translation' reads: "Koptite Osiris, Foremost of the Gold House, gives life to Pamin, son of Pa-sher-Usir".[25] The Egyptian Pamin/Paniskos thus viewed Serapis as an *interpretatio Graeca* for Osiris of Koptos, just as he rendered his theophoric name "He of Min" in the Greek with "He who is consecrated to Pan". But he not only translated the name Osiris as the recipient of the donation with the name Serapis but chose for the equivalent of his patronymic

---

[20] See UPZ I 19,3 (163 BC); 54,22 (161 BC); 57,7 (164–161 BC); 106,10–11 (99 BC); 107,12 (99 BC); 108,10 and 22 (99 BC); a temple of Serapis in Oxyrhynchos/Fayyum would be called Osorapieion as late as the 3rd century AD: PSI X 1128,22.

[21] Cf. Fraser (1972), I, 227 and 263.

[22] Cf. Bommas (2005), 25.

[23] Cf. Stambaugh (1972), 37.

[24] Lüddeckens and Thissen (2000), 232. However, the name could also simply be a consonant transfer into Demotic (*ibid.*, 933).

[25] Vleeming (2001), No. 250 A and B.

"Child of Osiris" the Greek form Sarapion.[26] Other documents show, however, that Osiris and Serapis were to be viewed as two distinct deities. Thus they could occur side by side in dedications.[27] Serapis is normally to be viewed as a deity all his own.

If we look at the Greek view of the deity, it can be said that, with this deity, aspects of the father god and saviour god Zeus and the underworld god Pluto were also merged with aspects of the fertility god Dionysos and the healing god Asklepios.[28] The perception of Serapis as a Greek deity occurred, however, only among the Egyptians, who were never able to become reconciled with worshipping him. For Greeks—and, later, Romans—the god was an Egyptian god: the consort of Isis.

Cult for the Deity

The cult for Serapis forged Greek and Egyptian elements into something new which appealed especially to the non-Egyptian subjects of the kingdom but also to the subjects of other Diadochi states.[29] Primarily the appearance of the god was Greek; possibly the cult statue created by Bryaxis was to become the model: a statue depicting a seated man with a beard (as a mark of the father deity), wearing the *kalathos* on his head (as a mark of the fertility deity), with the three-headed dog Cerberus seated at his side, the guardian of the underworld (to indicate the underworld deity).[30] In addition, significant elements of the tradition of Greek Mysteries appear to have been incorporated into the cult rituals.[31] The annual replacement of the temple priests in many

[26] On the identification of both gods in the Osiris sanctuary of Abydos, cf. *SB* I 169; I 1046; I 1053–1059; I 3731; 3742; I 3750/52; I 3776; Stambaugh (1972), 37–38; Fraser (1960). 6, n. 6; cf. also the grave stele Bernand (1992), No. 92, where Osiris is identified with Serapis.

[27] Stambaugh (1972), 50–51; see, for example, Vidman (1969), No. 3132–3133, from Mysia: "Serapis, Isis, Anubis, Harpokrates, Osiris, Apis, Helios"; see also OGIS I 97,4–7, which Fraser (1972), 253, translates as "Osoros who is also Serapis". I do not think it is possible to translate the Greek conjunction "te kai" as an equivalent of "ho kai" and would prefer to translate "Osoros and Serapis".

[28] Stambaugh (1972).

[29] Huss (2001), 245–247; Fraser (1960), 19: "I would suggest that, in creating Serapis, Ptolemy did not have the Egyptian population in his mind at all, but aimed at giving the Greek population of Egypt … a patron deity."

[30] See Hornbostel (1973); Schmidt (2005), who rejects a creation by Bryaxis.

[31] Bommas (2005), 31, even assumes that the cult for Serapis was wholly Greek, which I think goes too far.

cult sites outside Egypt can also be traced back to Greek influence.[32] The existence of the temple servant office of a *neokoros* could also indicate a strong Greek influence.[33] On the other hand, many typically Egyptian priestly titles are represented in the Serapis cult, for example, the prophets, *stolistai* (responsible for clothing the deity), chanters and *pastophorai* (bearers of the deity's dwelling during processions).[34] The Egyptian element in the deity's appearance is indicated by the *atef* crown in some depictions, a crown the bearded god can be seen to wear on coins since the time of Ptolemy II.[35] But the cult and festival trappings associated with the deity likely assumed Egyptian forms of expression as well.[36] Furthermore, the Serapis priesthood seems to have been subject to an Egyptian training. For example, a sacred law from Priene has been preserved from the end of the third century BC according to which only Egyptians were allowed to perform cult proceedings for Isis, Serapis and Anubis.[37] On Delos as well, initially only Egyptians, descendants of a Memphite immigrant, practiced as priests of the deity.[38] And, finally, the union of Greek and Egyptian elements can be found most significantly in the Serapieion in Alexandria, which was a Greek temple, but which contained a Nilometer and the subterranean galleries emulated from the Memphite Serapieion.[39]

The amalgam of Greek and Egyptian cult forms arising in such a manner are repeated even in the legend of the founding of the cult, handed down to us in greatest detail by Plutarch and Tacitus.[40] They report that Serapis appeared twice to Ptolemy I in a dream. According to the story, the deity had given the king the task of bringing his statue located in Sinope on the Black Sea to Alexandria.[41] The god was worshipped in Sinope under the name Pluto. The king learned that the

---

[32] Vidman (1970), 37: "In the beginnings of the cult, there were, in contrast, often many hereditary lifelong priestly offices"; *ibid.*, 48.

[33] Vidman (1970), 53–60.

[34] Otto (1905), I, p. 115; Vidman (1970), 60–65.

[35] Castiglione (1978), 208–232, pl. XIX–XXVII.

[36] Kessler (2000), 208–211; Wilcken *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, 92–95, is still important; he supposes it to have been an amalgam of Greek and Egyptian cult forms; Borgeaud and Volokhine (2000), 75–76, emphasise the strong Egyptian or Memphite relation to the Serapis cult.

[37] Vidman (1969), No. 291.

[38] Cf. Engelmann (1975); Vidman (1970), 35–36; Fraser (1972), 254.

[39] Cf. McKenzie et al. (2004), 111.

[40] Tacitus, Annales IV, 83–84; Plutarch, de Iside 28; cf. Fauth (1976); Scheer (2000), 260–266.

[41] Cf. most recently Borgeaud and Volokhine (2000), 38–46.

statue was of Serapis after advice by the Egyptian priest Manetho and the Athenian Timotheus, who was descended from the priestly caste of the Eumolpidae that conducted the Eleusinian Mysteries. Whereupon Ptolemy had the statue brought to his new capital city and had a new cult site erected where an ancient Serapis and Isis sanctuary had stood. The god had therefore already existed; only his appearance in the form of the statue was new. Ptolemy's support handed down in this manner through the Greek Mysteries expert Timotheus and the Egyptian priest Manetho may be considered as a reaction to the efforts of the king to create a cult which united the tradition of the Greek Mysteries with the Egyptian cult of the gods.

Serapis and the Greek Subjects

The earliest Greek inscriptions transmitted from Alexandria are dedications to Serapis and Isis.[42] For example, the following statue dedication was found in the Alexandrian Serapieion, dating from the time of Ptolemy I:

> Delok[les had it (i.e. the statue) m]ade. Aristodemos, son of Dio[..]os, Athenian, had it (dedicated) to Serapis and to Isis.[43]

It is most probable that the benefactor belonged to the *classe supérieure*,[44] so that the inscription may be considered as documentation for the influence of the new cult on the ruling elite.[45] During the reign of Ptolemy II as well, there were two Alexandrian dedications to Serapis. One is addressed solely to the deity,[46] the second concerns the endowment of a sacred precinct for Serapis and his cult companion Isis:

> On behalf of King Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Berenike, the saviours, Archagathos, son of Agathokles, the overseer of the (nome [district])

[42] Bernand (2001), Nos. 1 and 2.

[43] Bernand (2001), No. 2; incorrectly cited by Borgeaud and Volokhine (2000), 58, n. 92, as the dedication of an altar.

[44] Bernand (2001), 18.

[45] Even the Fayyum yielded a dedication to Serapis and Isis, established by a Thessalonian soldier called Aristophanes, son of Aristophanes. The stone is dated to the end of the 4th century BC (SB I 2596 = SEG XVIII 657 = XXIV 1207; for the dating, see Launey (1987), 216, n. 1).

[46] See Bernand (2001), No. 4. Some date the inscription to the rule of Ptolemy I; see Borgeaud and Volokhine (2000), 58, n. 92, with additional literature.

> Libya and his wife Stratonike, (have dedicated) the *temenos* [precinct] to Serapis and Isis.[47]

It is not surprising that the endowment of the *temenos* occurred for the health and good fortune of the ruler, as Greeks often linked dedications to deities with the hope for the protection and the health of the king. Serapis especially was doubtless popular in this respect because of his healing function as the guaranteeing deity. The dedication clearly shows that the cult for Serapis had already been taken up by the Greek elite during the reign of Ptolemy II and that the Greeks not only worshipped the deity with a cult but even erected a sacred precinct for the god out of their own pockets.

It is remarkable, however, that, in the present case, a sacred precinct was provided for by private citizens for Serapis as well as for Isis. In fact, no documentation exists showing that the royal dynasty founded a temple at any time for both deities *together*.[48] The great Alexandrian Serapieion, for example, was a temple dedicated to Serapis alone but one where naturally other deities—primarily Isis and Harpokrates—were worshipped in side chapels. The king viewed Serapis primarily as an independent deity perhaps because he wished to emphasise the Apis aspect of the god.[49] The Greek subjects, in contrast, seem to have viewed the new deity primarily as an *interpretatio Graeca* of the pan-Egyptian Osiris. When they spoke of Serapis, they were not thinking principally of Apis but of Osiris, the god of the underworld and of fertility who almost always appeared together with his cult companion and consort Isis. The popular union of the two deities also found its way into the official King's Oaths, which have been known in the Greek and Egyptian languages since the time of Ptolemy III.[50] They read as follows:

> I swear by King Ptolemy, son of King Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the sibling gods, and by Queen Berenike, the sister and consort of the king, and by the sibling gods and the saviour gods, by their ancestors and by Isis and Serapis.[51]

---

[47] Bernand (2001), No. 5; cf. Bagnall (1976).

[48] Fraser (1960), 4–5: "Possibly, therefore, the association of the two in Egypt was due rather to popular ideas than to official encouragement."

[49] There was a separate cult for the mother of Apis, the Isis cow, at the Serapieion as well; see Thompson (1988), 194.

[50] Wilcken *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, 84; Minas (2000), 167; a compilation of the oaths can be found in the latter, p. 168, n. 643.

[51] P.Eleph. 23,8–12; P.Tebt. III 1, 815, col. IV 21–23; cf. Minas (2000), 165; 163–171.

Thus it is clear that Serapis and Isis, besides the reigning divine royal pair and their ancestors, had become the most important gods of the Ptolemaic kingdom, on whom oaths were taken. The ruling divine pair on earth had thus found its counterpart in the cosmic divine pair Isis and Serapis.[52] In addition, the placement of Serapis and Isis alongside the royal pair could point out that the cult for these gods was closely tied to the cult for the other and thus also supported the identification with the Ptolemaic kingdom and the royal dynasty.

Zoilos and his Dream of Serapis

The following illustrates how Greeks during the reign of Ptolemy II actively attempted to participate in spreading the Serapis cult. A petition from 257 BC to Apollonios, the "Finance Minister" (*dioiketes*) of Ptolemy II, was submitted by a Greek named Zoilos from Aspendos in Pamphylia (Asia Minor).[53] At that time, the area belonged to the Ptolemaic kingdom. Zoilos wrote that as he "was worshipping the god Serapis for your good health (*hugieia*) and your success (*euhemeria*) by the King Ptolemy (II), it happened that Serapis [enjoined] to me several times in my dreams to sail to visit you and [tell you about] this injunction: a [temple][54] must be built for him together with a precinct (*temenos*) in the Greek quarter near the harbour, and a priest must preside over the sacrifices and the cult on your behalf."

Serapis appeared to the Greek as an oracle deity in a dream after the Greek had prayed to the deity, evidently in private, for the good health of Apollonios and his success with the king. In this manner Zoilos placed the establishment of the cult and the temple in connection with the well-being of Apollonios. If the temple were erected, then Apollonios as well would continue to stand in the good graces of the king and remain healthy.

The sacrifices in the projected temple were to be made then for Serapis, but "on behalf of Apollonios". This wording is extremely unusual. Normally sacrifices were made to the respective deities in the

---

[52] Stambaugh (1972), 32–33, dedicated to Serapis and Isis as "cosmic counterpart for the man and woman on the throne of Alexandria".

[53] Hölbl's statements demonstrate that this letter counts among the most commented of the Zenon Archives (Hölbl (1993), 29, with literature on the letter in n. 113).

[54] I think that 'altar' as a possible reconstruction is less probable, as a *temenos* must normally have a *naos*.

temples, frequently "on behalf of the king".[55] It is also known from other Ptolemaic documents that sacrifices dedicated to gods were made in favour of functionaries[56]–but, as far as I know, these sacrifices did not occur in a temple. In the present case, the *dioiketes* of the king had assumed a royal position in the temple. From that alone, it can be seen how much the petitioner acting as the endower of a cult wished to influence Apollonios in his own favour.

Zoilos twice refused to grant the deity the wish expressed in the dream, for which he was struck with grave illness. He finally wrote this letter in which he described the whole story to the Finance Minister, and he closed the letter by returning to the essence of his prayer:

> It is therefore right, Apollonios, for you to follow the god's commands so that Serapis may be merciful to you and may greatly increase your standing with the king and your prestige (*poludoxoteron*), and make you enjoy good bodily health. Do not therefore fear that the expense will prove to be great, for it will be very profitable; I shall jointly supervise all these works. Farewell.[57]

The petitioner thus set the second most important man in the Ptolemaic kingdom under pressure: If Apollonios made constructing the temple possible, then one could pray for his welfare—this was, according to the information of the dream oracle, guaranteed solely by the founding of the cult for Serapis in the city concerned.[58] In addition, Zoilos indirectly pointed out that the endowment was to be entirely according to the wishes of the king, as the financing by Apollonios would also raise his prestige (*doxa*). The costs incurred from the construction were admittedly rather high, but they would be nothing in comparison to the health of Apollonios and his success with the king, all of which may be implied from the statement "it will be very profitable".

Thus, since the reign of Ptolemy II, not only dedications to Serapis can be documented in union with Isis, but even temple endowments or attempts at private temple endowments for the god by Greeks. The new

---

[55] Cf., for example, IG Fayoum II 118,11–13.

[56] Cf., for example, the endowment (on behalf of) the Epistrategos Boethos OGIS I 111.

[57] P.Cair. Zen. I 59034 with the reconstructions according to Clarysse and Vandorpe (1995), 78.

[58] Cf. Clarysse and Vandorpe (1995), 85: le culte "reste fondé sur le principe primitif du do ut des: érige un temple et tu obtiendras la faveur du roi; sinon, tu seras frappé de maladie".

cult had, as can be seen, found its devotees especially among the Greeks and obviously enjoyed certain popularity. It was particularly in those possessions outside Egypt that the Graeco-Egyptian hybrid cult may have, in addition, supported identification with Egypt and its Ptolemaic ruling power. Whoever performed the Serapis cult, that is, a cult with Greek and Egyptian elements, identified himself with the power and rule of the Ptolemies, who also sought to unite Greek with Egyptian elements in their official representation.

Ptolemy II and the Beginnings of the Ruler Cult

Ptolemy II went one step further than his father, who had the cult created for Serapis and ultimately also the Greek form of the Egyptian god. Whereas his father had been interested in using the Serapis cult to strengthen his royal power especially with his non-Egyptian subjects, his son recognised the possibilities of being deified as a living ruler by grateful subjects and the thus inherent possibilities of creating a religious bond for the various ethnic groups of his kingdom. In certain circles, Ptolemy I had already been worshipped as saviour, indeed even as a deity.[59] Ptolemy II then had his deceased parents officially deified as gods of the Ptolemaic kingdom.[60] In 272/271 BC, he had himself and his consort Arsinoe II associated with the cult for Alexander the Great under the name "sibling gods" (*theoi adelphoi*).[61] With this act, he created an official ruler cult with the purpose of better propagating it through association with the cult for Alexander the Great. The Alexander priest residing in Alexandria, by whom the respective records were dated, had then become a priest of the sibling gods as well. In this manner, the second Ptolemy pair became gods sharing the temple of Alexander. As the Alexander priest must be named in the dating prescript of every Greek and Demotic record, the subjects were reminded daily of the divinity of the ruler. The new cult demonstrated its autonomy and independence from the Alexander cult in that Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II received their own sacred precinct (*temenos*) in Alexandria.[62]

---

[59] Cf. Habicht (1970), 109–110.

[60] Hölbl (1994), 87.

[61] Huss (2001), 325; cf. P.Hib. II 199,15–17; on the latter, see Hauben (1983), 113, n. 57; Fraser (1972), I, 216.

[62] Herodas I 30; see Fraser (1972), I, 228; Grimm (1998), 73.

The sister consort of Ptolemy II, Arsinoe II, played an exceptional role in this new ruler cult.[63] Ptolemy had already scandalised the Greek world when he married his own sister. Those who scoffed at the incest between king and queen, as did the poet Sotades, had to pay with their lives for their mockery. The court poets, however, compared the sibling marriage with the *hieros gamos* of Zeus and Hera.[64] Even during her lifetime, the queen was worshipped under the invocation 'the brother loving' (*philadelphos*).[65] She had probably already been the object of a cult by this time as Arsinoe-Philadelphos. Even during her lifetime,[66] Arsinoe had received her own temple at the Cape of Zephyrion and, there, became the patron goddess of seafaring as the Cypriot Aphrodite-Arsinoe. Outside Egypt, the cult for Arsinoe II was also to achieve great significance; even towns were named after Arsinoe.[67]

According to the Mendes Stele inscription written in hieroglyphics, Arsinoe's consort elevated her after her death to the temple-sharing goddess of all Egyptian temples.[68] An Egyptian goddess had now emerged from the Greek goddess Arsinoe, appearing in a completely Egyptian form on the temple reliefs and votive steles.[69] In Memphis in particular, within the sphere of influence of the high priests of Ptah and of the Serapieion, the Egyptian cult for the new goddess was accorded great significance.[70] It even seems that she received the honour of temple-sharing not only in the realm of the Egyptian cult but that Arsinoe was also able to become the temple-sharing goddess in the Greek sanctuaries. At least this is suggested in a papyrus from the end of the third century BC. We meet there a "priest of Arsinoe and of Zeus Kasios".[71] It is probable that the priest in the temple of Zeus Kasios in Pelusion performed duties where Arsinoe was worshipped as a temple-sharing goddess.[72] It is also important to point out that Arsinoe was identified not only with the Greek Aphrodite[73] but also

[63] Basic information: Hölbl (1994), 94–98.
[64] Cf. Grimm (1998), 70.
[65] According to Fraser (1972), 217; cf. Theokrit XVII 128–130.
[66] Hauben (1970), 42–46.
[67] Compiled in Hölbl (1994), 391 [Register 2].
[68] Mendes Stele, Z. 13–14; Sethe (1904), 41.
[69] Quaegebeur 'Arsinoe Philadelphos at Memphis', 239–270; Quaegebeur 'Ptolémée II en adoration', 191–217; Albersmeier and Minas (1998).
[70] Cf. Crawford (1980), 23–31.
[71] P.Heid. VI 378,3–4.
[72] Duttenhöfer (1994), 120.
[73] Tondriau (1948), 16–18.

with the Egyptian counterpart Isis—and not simply by Egyptians[74] but also by Greeks.[75]

The Merging of the Ruler and Serapis Cult and its Spread

Research is divided on whether a temple for the dynasty god had existed before Ptolemy III erected the great Serapieion in the Alexandrian district of Rhakotis,[76] but it is very probable that Ptolemy I had already had a sanctuary for Serapis erected on the same spot.[77] In fact, floors of polished gravel were found under the Serapieion built by Ptolemy III, floors presumably belonging to a preceding structure—an older *temenos* for Serapis.[78] On one of these floors, a Greek altar was found still showing painted garlands and cyma and bearing the dedication inscription "(Altar) of King Ptolemy and Arsinoe Philadelphos, (descendants) of the saviour gods".[79] The ruler cult for Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II was thus evidently performed in the *temenos*, next to the sanctuary.[80]

As Ptolemy and Arsinoe do not appear on the altar under the cult name *theoi philadelphoi*, a *terminus ante quem* of 272/271 is highly likely because the ruling couple appeared under this cult name after that time. The fact that it was placed in the Serapieion erected, in all likelihood, by Ptolemy I suggests that the altar was a site for the official cult of the ruling pair. A *terminus post quem* for the place of sacrifice would be the year Berenike I, the consort of Ptolemy I, died, for both had been worshipped under the name of 'saviour gods' after that time, i.e., since 279 BC. Arsinoe, who came to Egypt around 279 BC, was the consort of Ptolemy II in 274 BC, at the latest. Thus the altar was probably erected between 279/274 BC and 272/271 BC.[81] For the official ruler

[74] Sethe (1904), 80,10; Quaegebeur 'Arsinoe Philadelphos at Memphis', 242; 246–248.

[75] Thompson (1973), 67; 70; 74.

[76] For example, Tkaczow (1984), 14.

[77] Hölbl (1994), 93–94; Kessler (2000), 192–194; Grimm (1998), 82.

[78] It has not yet been resolved to what extent this structure is identical with the "Serapeum of Parmeniskos" in Alexandria, built in the era of Ptolemy II mentioned in the Zenon Archive (P.Cair. Zenon 59355,103; 128; 243 BC); Fraser (1967), 39, and Hölbl (1993), 28–29 are opposed; Dunand (1973), 56, thinks it possible.

[79] Bernand (2001), No. 8; Grimm (1983), 70–73.

[80] Fraser (1960), 18; Grimm (1983), 72.

[81] See Grimm (1983), 72–73. He thinks that the mention of the *theoi Adelphoi* is not

cult, this meant that it had, in all probability, existed before the introduction of the name 'sibling gods' for the ruling pair and, in any case, already during the lifetime of Arsinoe. In addition, it can be demonstrated that here, directly at the beginning of the new official ruler cult, it was unified as a cult with the Serapis cult, for, if an altar stood in the Serapieion where sacrifice was offered for the royal pair, it meant that the ruling couple counted among the *synnaoi theoi* of Serapis. In the period following, (colossal) statues of the Ptolemies stood next to those of Serapis in the Serapis temple in Alexandria, as is documented, for example, for Ptolemy III. Thus the successor pair also had themselves elevated to the temple-sharing gods of Serapis.[82] Fragments of statues were also found of which one head could be attributed to Ptolemy IV and one to Arsinoe III.[83] With a third head, that of Serapis, they had formed a larger-than-life acrolithic statue group.[84]

As early as the era of Ptolemy II, the officially instituted ruler cult had frequently been organised by cult associations, so-called *basilistai*. As can be seen in the Boethos inscription from the second century BC, these organisations were under the leadership of high-ranking military officers and administrative functionaries.[85] It can be assumed that the cult associations were organised especially within the military. They offered military personnel from the diverse ethnic groups of southeastern Europe and the Near East an opportunity for religious worship of the ruler transcending cultural and religious strictures, a network of social security and, what was surely very important, also the opportunity of celebrating festivals together. Under the leadership of a certain Diokles, such a *ruler-cult*-association of the Ptolemaic military garrison on the Cyclades island of Thera endowed an offering box or temple repository (*thesauros*) at the local temple of Serapis, Isis and

necessary, because he supposes that the above-mentioned *temenos* of the *theoi Adelphoi* was in the Serapieion and the same place where the altar was erected. Just as Fraser (1972), II, 386, n. 367, I think this is not likely: "I do not believe that this small and insignificant temenos is the *theôn Adelfôn temenos* referred to by Herodas in line 26 (…). If it were, that passage would necessarily have been written before Euergetes' Serapeum was built, and the sanctuary demolished. His reference is no doubt to the main shrine of the Theoi Adelphoi, whereever that was."

[82] P.Haun 6, Fgt. 1, Z. 21; for this, cf. Habicht (1980), 4–5.

[83] Grimm (1998), 86–87, fig. 85a and 85c.

[84] Kyrieleis (1979), 386–387, who points out, however, that it could not have been cult images, as the cult image of Serapis looked different; see also Grimm and Wildung (1987), Nos. 113–114.

[85] Cf. Pfeiffer (2005).

Anubis.[86] The pronounced Egyptian character of the cult site can be found not only in the juxtaposition of Isis to Serapis but primarily because the dog-headed god Anubis, as is often the case, also shares the temple with Serapis.[87] The inscription in question can likely be dated to the time of Ptolemy II; the temple itself was founded on the island perhaps as early as Ptolemy I.[88] I think this suggests that the *basilistai* not only organised the endowment at the temple but also performed the rituals of the ruler cult at the temple, possibly in the temple itself. No doubt an altar stood here for the rulers, just as in the Alexandrian Serapieion. Bommas even thinks that two of the four existing cult niches in the sanctuary were reserved for the statues of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II.[89] The merging of the cult for Serapis with the ruler cult organised by the association might, in any case, have been oriented towards the official model of Alexandria. Apart from that, a dedication to Arsinoe Philadelphos ascribed to the same sanctuary demonstrates the degree to which the cult for Serapis was associated with the ruler cult on the island.[90]

The private endowment of a sanctuary in Halikarnassos also illustrates the close ties of the ruler cult and Serapis cult outside Egyptian territory of the Ptolemaic kingdom.[91] The inscription reads:

> Good Fortune! On behalf of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy the saviour and the god [—], to Serapis, Isis, Arsinoe Philadelphos (or: Isis-Arsinoe Philadelphos), has NN, son of Chairemon, [the templebuilder?], dedicated the temple.

The god of the Ptolemies, Serapis, is united not only with his consort Isis in the cult but also with the goddess Arsinoe. As has been mentioned above, an assimilation of Arsinoe Philadelphos with the Egyptian goddess Isis frequently occurred. Thus the temple in Halikarnassos, as Brady rightly assumes, could have been dedicated to the goddess Isis-Arsinoe as cult companion of Serapis.[92] One can hardly imagine a more explicit relationship of the Serapis cult and the ruler cult.

---

[86] IG XII 3,443 = Vidmann (1969), Nr. 137; Bagnall (1976), 129; on the significance of the *Thesauros*, cf. Fraser (1960), 24.

[87] Cf. Fraser (1960), 6.

[88] Cf. Gaertringen (1899), I, 264.

[89] Bommas (2005), 44; one wonders, however, where Anubis would have been put.

[90] IG XII 3,462 = OGIS I 34.

[91] Vidmann (1969), No. 270. Cf. the remarks by Fraser (1960), 34. The dating by Mayr (2004), 28, to the time of Ptolemy I has been obsolete for a long time.

[92] Brady (1978), 13; cf. OGIS I 31.

In summary, it can be said of the Greek Alexandria and the Ptolemaic possessions outside Egypt that an extremely close relationship existed between the Serapis cult and the ruler cult and that both cults were actively practiced and organised by private groups, whether by soldiers, as in Thera, or by urban civil servants, as in Halikarnassos. It can be assumed that the Alexandrian Serapieion, with its official relationship of Serapis cult and the ruler cult, had adopted a role model function for this merging in the Greek world. As can be observed, Ptolemy II had recognised the popularity of the Serapis cult among his Greek subjects and hoped for a greater propagation of the ruler cult through the ties to the Serapis cult. He was evidently successful, as the cited private endowments involving Serapis demonstrate.

The Serapis Cult in the Chora—the Exceptional Case of Philadelphia

From Apollonios, the Finance Minister of Ptolemy II named above, a not insignificant part of the correspondence between the most important man after the king and his administrator Zenon has been transmitted through the so-called Zenon Archive. The letter of Zoilos cited above is ascribed to this collection of writings. Fraser is, of course, correct when he writes that Serapis was barely mentioned in the archive,[93] but what we learn from the archive about the Serapis cult and its relationship to the ruler cult is quite interesting.

Apollonios was responsible for the planning of the village of Philadelphia, located in the northeast of the Fayyum, in the Herakleides district. The village originated from one of the military colonies set up by Ptolemy II and was laid out on the pattern of a chessboard. It was thus a new founding in the Greek sense, designed essentially for the soldiers of Ptolemy's army.[94] The name Philadelphia itself demonstrates the close ties of the founder to the royal house, for it was the cult epithet of the Queen Arsinoe II. A letter concerning Philadelphia by Apollonios from 256 BC[95] to his administrator Zenon has been transmitted as follows:

---

[93] Fraser (1960), 8; on the namings of Serapis in the Zenon Archive, see Borgeaud and Volokhine (2000), 59, n. 92.

[94] On the settlement of the new founding, see Clarysse (1980), 105–122.

[95] On the dating, see Pestman (1981), I, 103.

> Apollonios sends greetings to Zenon. [You should command] a Ser[apis temple (Serapieion)] to be built at the Temple of Isis (Isieion), located [beside the Temple of the] Dioscuri and as far as the measured-off building site for [the sibling gods/the rulers]. See to it that only one *dr*[*omos* (passageway)] leads [to both] sanctuaries along the side of the canal. Farewell![96]

The letter indicates that the highest authorities endeavoured to promote the Serapis cult in the *chora* (countryside) as well by having a sanctuary for Serapis erected. The common use of the *dromos* mentioned here was possible at the site because the sanctuaries were located opposite each other to the extent that they were joined by the passageway for cult processions.[97] According to Hölbl, the Serapieion precinct in Memphis served as a model.[98] There, the east temple from the period of Nectanabo II was also linked with the temple of Osiris-Apis by a straight *dromos* which was later also copied at the site of the Isis-Serapis sanctuary on Delos and the Iseum Campense (Isis Temple on the Field of Mars) in Rome.[99] The Isis and Serapis temples were separated physically from each other but united in the cult processions of public festivals by a *dromos*.

Just as on the island of Thera, there in the middle of Egypt, the Serapis cult was to offer chiefly the soldiers of Ptolemy's army, as already mentioned the majority of the Philadelphia inhabitants, a focal point for their religious needs. In addition, such a hybrid cult could facilitate identification with the new homeland in Egypt. The military colony Philadelphia represents one of the very few examples from the early Ptolemaic era for the Serapis cult in the *chora*. It is also one of the few examples of cult massively supported by the official authorities and also established principally for non-Egyptians. Otherwise, there is hardly any evidence for worship of Serapis in the early Ptolemaic era within Egypt; it appears isolated since in the second century BC.[100] One of the few early examples of the Serapis cult practiced by Egyptians comes from a village, not localised in more detail, named Temenus in Fayyum and also mentioned in the Zenon correspondence: the application by an Egyptian priest of Isis and Serapis named Phemennas, who made sacrifices for Isis and Arsinoe-

[96] P.Cair. Zen. II 59168 (= SB III 6806); cf. Hölbl (1993), 23.
[97] So already Wilcken 'Papyrus-Urkunden', 66; also Hölbl (1993), 23.
[98] Hölb (1993), 24.
[99] Bruneau (1980); Roullet (1972), 30, fig. 349 f. and 352.
[100] Cf. Fraser (1960), 8.

Philadelphos on behalf of the king in his Iseion, that is, perhaps in a small private cult chapel.[101] The priest does not mention a sacrifice for Serapis because, in this particular case, the request was for donations for the Isis and Arsinoe sacrifice. Furthermore, because of the Egyptian authorship, an Egyptian cult may be assumed; Arsinoe-Philadelphos was thus worshipped here as an Egyptian goddess as she had been elevated by Ptolemy II to temple-sharing goddess of all Egyptian sanctuaries.[102] The Egyptian priest of Serapis and of Isis represents one of the few examples for the Egyptian Serapis-Isis cult in the *chora* which was furthermore as in Halikarnassos tied to the ruler cult. And this leads then to the question of the relationship of the ruler cult and the Serapis cult in the *chora*.

The Ruler Cult in Philadelphia

The importance of the papyrus on temple construction cited above is not only that a Serapis temple was to be newly built in Philadelphia but also that another building plot (*topos*) existed and was planned for the construction of a temple for the ruling pair. The text was reconstructed by the first editor with 'to the sibling gods'.[103] Wilcken, however, suggested the reconstruction 'to the kings' (*tois basileusin*), which is the same in content, as this reading also means Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II.[104] P.Cair. Zenon II 59169 also points to this projected temple of the rulers, a text which Tait reconstructed as follows:

> Apollonios to Zenon, greetings. [Whenever] Antikritos [arrives, show him] both the [whole] village, and the site where we propose [to construct the temple] of the king and of (Queen) Phila[delphos, the Gods Adelphoi,] and the sacred-way, and the [sacred-grove (?). And show him] both the irrigation-basins and the [—of my estate;] and make it clear that we have only recently [begun] to establish [the village.] Farewell.[105]

---

[101] PSI V 539; cf. Hölbl (1993), 25; Dunand (1973), I, 137–138; Rübsam (1974), 192.

[102] Less probable is that Egyptian cult and Greek cult were celebrated next to each other in the chapel in question, as Dunand (1973), 166, n. 3, suggests.

[103] P. Edg. 91,3–4.

[104] Wilcken 'Papyrus-Urkunden', 66; cf. Edgar, in: P.Cair. Zen. II 59168 (p. 22, commentary): "It is possible that here too the place in question was the site selected for the cult of the sovereigns".

[105] Tait, in: Pestman (1980), No. 28; cf. Edgar, in: P.Cair. Zen. II 59168 (p. 23, commentary), cf. also Wilcken 'Papyrus-Urkunden', 66–67.

In Philadelphia, besides the temple for Serapis, Isis and the sibling gods, there was also a temple solely for Arsinoe, the eponymous goddess of the village.[106] It is known from an account of payments to workmen that around 255/254 BC a large canal was being built in Philadelphia which was to bring water to this Arsinoeion. This temple is also the topic of the following letter to Zenon:

> To Zenon greetings from Peteërmotis, [known to (?)] you from the Serapieion. I petitioned you then about the temple of Arsinoe which is to be built in order that I might come here. So, if you agree, let me serve [under you] here—I am not alone, but have a family—so that I may offer prayers both for the king and [for your own well-being]. I have written to you so that no one else pushes in, but it is I who serves you. Farewell.[107]

In my opinion, the petition shows how closely the ruler cult was amalgamated with the cult for Serapis and what sort of person can be 'read between the lines' of this petition. Peteërmotis seems to have been, as Skeat observed, an employee of the Serapieion of Memphis.[108] This Egyptian saw himself as being able to perform a service, no matter what nature, in the Arsinoe temple in Philadelphia. This temple was still under construction at the time of the petition. Evidently the founder of the village and the Finance Minister of Ptolemy II had the authority to determine the appointment of the employees of the ruler cult temple; perhaps he was even the high priest of the sanctuary himself, for the Egyptian wanted 'to serve under him' or 'to be at his service', 'to be with him' (*huparchein para soi*).

A first, not transmitted petition was not enough for the petitioner to prevail in his application—in fact, he was worried that another could 'worm his way in'–so that he again pressured the *dioiketes* with the present petition to select him for service. He underlined his request by emphasising that he had a family (*oikeious*) whom he probably had to feed, and he argued further that he could also send up prayers for the welfare of the king and doubtless for Apollonios as well—Zoilos submitted a similar reason for his request (see above).

---

[106] Cf. P.Cair. Zen. II 59169,5 according to the reconstruction by Wilcken 'Papyrus-Urkunden', 280; and P.Cair. Zen. IV 59745,32.

[107] P.Lond. VII 2046; translation: Rowlandson (1998), 28, Doc. 28.

[108] Skeat (1974), 193; PSI V 531 documents Zenon's stay in the Serapeum in Memphis, where the priest of Astarte of Memphis presented him with a petition.

Unfortunately, we do not know what kind of temple of Arsinoe was in Philadelphia, whether it was a Greek or an Egyptian cult structure.[109] The fact that an Egyptian considered himself suited for service in the temple in question and that he emphasised his qualification as a cult servant of Serapis could point to an Egyptian or, as would be possible in the Serapieion in Alexandria, to a Graeco-Egyptian temple for the hybrid cult.

It can be said that the Serapis, Isis, ruler and Arsinoe cult in the Philadelphia military settlement was closely associated in its cult forms and that authorities wished to offer the non-Egyptians the demanded focal point for their religious needs.

Summary

The fate of the living Apis bull was very closely tied to that of the Pharaoh; the Apis guaranteed the well-being of the king. All the Ptolemaic kings were to take special care of the royal animal's welfare. In its after-death form as Osiris-Apis, the god then entered into one of the most important cults of the kingdom, the cult of Serapis. Obviously Ptolemy I was interested in a relationship between Egyptian ideas of the Memphian royal god Apis, the pan-Egyptian underworld and fertility god Osiris and Greek father deities such as Zeus and Pluto as well as in the fertility and dynasty god Dionysos and the healing god Asklepios. As early as Ptolemy II, the new creation had been so well accepted by the Hellenistic subjects that they actively worked toward spreading the cult of the kingdom—as the four cited temple foundings document.[110] Serapis and Isis had become deities for identification with the motherland of the ruling power, especially in the possessions of the Ptolemaic kingdom outside Egypt. The cult offered the Greeks an inestimable medium for identifying with the kingdom and offered for the soldiers on Thera and doubtless in other places also a means of creating identity in a 'globalised' *oikumene*. The same is true for the ruler cult introduced by Ptolemy II, a cult, as has been demonstrated,

[109] It seems somewhat hastily judged when Skeat (1974), 193, writes about the Arsinoeion: "where the cult was no doubt Greek".

[110] A fifth founding by General Kallikrathes in honour of Isis and Anubis may be added; Fraser (1972), I, 270–272, thinks that they belong to the two named gods as *synnaoi theoi* of Serapis.

which had close ties to the Serapis and Isis cult. Just as had been done probably by officials in the Serapieion in Alexandria, the merging of the ruler cult with the Serapis cult initiated by Ptolemy II was to serve as a model even for the ruler cult instituted privately and by organisations. With the aid of the popular Serapis religion, the new ruler cult could be spread among the 'Greeks' in the kingdom—the examples of the military from Thera and Philadelphia and the example of urban Halikarnossos as well as the petition of Zoilos document this. The merging of the Isis-Serapis cult to the ruler cult was manifested then beginning with Ptolemy III in the oaths to the king as well. Double dedications continued as well for Isis, Serapis and the ruling pair.[111] In addition, Demotic statutes from cult cooperatives have been transmitted from the later Ptolemaic era, in which it is reported that sacrifices for the Pharaohs, Serapis, Isis and all the gods of Egypt had been made.[112] Thus the deified living ruling pair along with Serapis and Isis, their 'cosmic' counterparts, played an exceptional role as the most important deities of the kingdom in the lives of their subjects, as they were present everywhere.

[111] SB I 585 (for Serapis, Isis, the Nile, Ptolemy III and Berenike II); 586 (for Serapis, Isis, Ptolemy III and Berenike II); 631a (for Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra III, their children, Isis and Serapis); OGIS I 62 (for Ptolemy III, Berenike II, Isis, Serapis und Harpokrates); 63 (for Serapis, Ptolemy III und Berenike II); 82 (for Ptolemy IV, Arsinoe III, Serapis und Isis); Bernand (1970), 235–236, No. 6.

[112] Cf. P.dem.Prag, Z. 5–6; P.dem.Cairo 31178,4–5; cf. De Cenival (1972).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

G.J.D. Aalders, *Political Thought in Hellenistic Times* (Amsterdam, 1975).

F.M. Abel, "Tombeaux récemment découverts à Marissa" *Revue Biblique* 34 (1925), 267–275.

Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)* (Cambridge, MA, 2004 [= Hellenic Studies, 2]).

William Y. Adams, *Nubia: Corridor to Africa* (Princeton, 1977).

F.E. Adcock, M.P. Charlesworth and S.A. Cook (eds.), *CAH* (vol. 7, Cambridge, 1928).

Sheila L. Ager, "An Uneasy Balance: from the Death of Seleukos to the Battle of Raphia" in Andrew Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 2003), 35–50.

———, "Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty" *JHS* 125 (2005), 1–34.

———, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 BC* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1996 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 18]).

S. Albersmeier and M. Minas, "Ein Weihrelief für die vergöttlichte Arsinoe II" in Willy Clarysse, Antoon Schoors, and Harco Willems (eds.), *Egyptian Religion: the Last Thousand Years: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur* (Leuven, 1998 [= *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, 84]), 2–29.

Robert V. Albis, *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Lanham, 1996).

Thomas G. Allen, *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth by Day: Ideas of the Ancient Egyptians Concerning the Hereafter as Expressed in their own Terms* (Chicago, 1974 [= Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 37]).

Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: a Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis, 1993).

P. Amandry, "Dédicaces delphiques" *BCH* 64–65 (1940–1941), 60–75.

W. Ameling, K. Bringmann and H. von Steuben (eds.), *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher in grieschische Städte und Heiligtümer* (vol. 1, *Zeugnisse und Kommentare*, Berlin, 1995).

W. Ameling, review of Erhard Grzybek, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaique: problèmes de chronologie hellénistique* (Basel, 1990), Gnomon 66 (1994), 325–331.

E. Andersson and N. Sjöberg, "E. Akmar, La stèle de Pithom et les estampages de M. Ed. Naville" *Sphinx* 8 (1904), 223–236.

Jan Assmann, *Ägypten: Eine Sinngeschichte* (Darmstadt, 1996).

———, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete* (Zurich and Munich, 1975).

———, *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca and London, 2005).

———, "Kulturelle und literarische Texte" in Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms* (Leiden and New York, 1996 [= Probleme der Ägyptologie, 10]), 59–82.

———, *Ma'at: Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im alten Ägypten* (Munich, 1990).

———, *The Mind of Egypt: History and Meaning in the Time of the Pharaohs* (New York, 2002).
———, "Die Verborgenheit des Mythos in Ägypten" *Göttinger Miszellen* 25 (1977): 7–43.
———, "Die Zeugung des Sohnes: Bild, Spiel, Erzählung und das Problem des ägyptischen Mythos" in Jan Assmann et al. (eds.), *Funktionen und Leistungen des Mythos: Drei altorientalische Beispiele* (Freiburg and Göttingen, 1982 [= Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 48]), 13–61.
A.E. Astin, see F.W. Walbank.
M. Astour, *Hellenosemitica: an Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece* (second edition, Leiden, 1967).
C. Austin and G. Bastianini (eds.), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Milan, 2002).
M.M. Austin, "Hellenistic Kings, War, and the Economy" *CQ* 36.2 (1986), 450–466.
———, *The Hellenistic world from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: a Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge, 1981).
Hector Avalos, *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East: The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel* (Atlanta, 1995 [= Harvard Semitic Monographs, 54]).
M. Avi-Yonah and Amos Kloner, "Maresha (Marisa)" in E. Stern (ed.) *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (vol. 3, Jerusalem, 1993), 948–957.
André Aymard, "Mercenariat et l'histoire grecque" in André Aymard (ed.) *Etudes d'histoire ancienne* (Paris, 1967 [= Publications de la Faculté des lettre et sciences humaines de Paris-Sorbonne. Etudes et méthodes, 16]), 487–498.
E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae 264–70 BC* (Oxford, 1958).
Roger S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt* (New York, 1976).
———, "Archagathos son of Agathokles, epistates of Libya" *Philologus* 120 (1976), 195–209.
Roger S. Bagnall and Bruce W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge, 1994).
Roger S. Bagnall and Peter Derow (eds.), *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation* (second edition, Oxford, 2004 [= Blackwell sourcebooks in ancient history, 1]).
Richard A. Baer, *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female* (Leiden, 1970 [= Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, 3]).
John Baines, "Egyptian Elite Self-Presentation in the Context of Ptolemaic Rule" in W.V. Harris and Giovanni Ruffini (eds.), *Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece* (Leiden, 2004 [= Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, 26]), 33–36.
———, "Egyptian Myth and Discourse: Myth, Gods, and the Early Written and Iconographic Record" *JNES* 50.2 (1991), 81–105.
———, "Myth and Literature" in Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms* (Leiden and New York, 1996 [= Probleme der Ägyptologie, 10]), 361–377.

———, "On Wenamun as a Literary Text" in Jan Assmann and Elke Blumenthal (eds.), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten: Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener, 5.-10. September 1996 in Leipzig* (Cairo, 1999 [= Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale. Bibliothèque d'étude, 127]), 209–233.

Mieke Bal, *Lethal Love: Feminist Literary Readings of Biblical Love Stories* (Bloomington, 1987).

———, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (third edition, Toronto, 1997).

A.A. Barb, "Mystery, Myth and Magic" in J.R. Harris (ed.), *The Legacy of Egypt* (Oxford, 1971), 138–169.

John M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1996).

Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus, 'On the Jews': Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1996).

———, *The Seleukid Army: Organisation and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge, 1976).

M.H. Barnes, *Inscribed Kleos: Aetiological Contexts in Apollonius of Rhodes* (Diss. Missouri, 2003).

D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton* (Leiden, 1963).

G. Bastianini, see C. Austin.

M. Baumbach, see Benjamin Acosta-Hughes.

A.J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du Livre des Proverbes* (Leipzig, 1890).

R. Bauslaugh, *The Concept of Neutrality in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1991).

Roger Beck, "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy, and the Ancient Novel" in Gareth Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden, 1996 [= *Mnemosyne* supplement 159]), 131–150.

Jürgen von Beckerath, *Chronologie des pharaonischen Ägypten* (Mainz, 1997 [= Münchener Ägyptologische Studien, 46]).

R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids, 1985).

H.I. Bell, "Brother and Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt" *Revue internationale des droits de l'Antiquité* 2 (1949), 83–92.

K.J. Beloch, "Die auswärtigen Besitzungen der Ptolemäer" *ArchPF* 2 (1903), 229–257.

———, *Griechische Geschichte* (second edition, vol. 4 part 2, Leipzig, 1925).

Hermann Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit* (fourth edition, Munich, 1969).

———, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums. Zweiter Band. Die Verträge der griechischen römischen Welt von 338 v. Chr.* (Munich, 1975).

Chris Bennett, "Cleopatra V Tryphaena and the Genealogy of the Later Ptolemies" *Ancient Society* 28 (1997), 39–66.

———, "Egyptian Royal Genealogy" http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/Egypt/index.htm (19 April 2005).

G. Benseler, see W. Pape.

J. Bergemann, "Die sogennante Lutrophoros: Grabmal für unverheiratete

Tote?" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Athenische Abteilung* 111 (1996), 149–190.
Jan Bergman, *Ich bin Isis: Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisaretalogien* (Uppsala, 1968 [= Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 3]).
Roland Bergmeier, "Zur Septuaginta-Übersetzung von Gen. 3:16" *ZATW* 79 (1967), 77–79.
Jocelyne Berlandini, "La déesse bucephale: une iconographie particulière de l'Hathor memphite" *BIFAO* 83 (1983), 33–50.
Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (New Brunswick, 1987).
Martin Bernal (edited by David Chioni Moore), *Black Athena Writes back: Martin Bernal Responds to his Critics* (Durham, NC, 2001).
Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, vol. 3, the Linguistic Evidence* (New Brunswick, 2006).
André Bernand, *Le Delta égyptien d'après les textes grecques. 1. les confins libyques* (Cairo, 1970).
———, *Le Paneion d'El Kanaïs: les inscriptions grecques* (Leiden, 1972).
———, "Les veilleurs du Phare" *ZPE* 113 (1996), 85–90.
Etienne Bernand, *Inscriptions grecques d'Alexandrie ptolémaïque* (Cairo, 2001 [= Publications de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 868]).
———, *Inscriptions grecques d'Égypte et de Nubie au Musée du Louvre* (Paris, 1992).
M. Bernstein, "Scripture: Quotation and Use" in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, 2000), 839–842.
Richard M. Berthold, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (London, 1984).
G. Bertram, 1936. "Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testamentes" *ZATW* 13 (1936), 153–167.
Helmut Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (2 vols., Munich, 1926).
E.R. Bevan, *The House of Ptolemy: a History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1927).
———, *The House of Seleucus* (London, 1902).
Charles Rowan Beye, *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982).
Brigitte Beyer-Rotthoff, *Untersuchungen zur Aussenpolitik Ptolemaios' III* (Bonn, 1993).
Reinhold Bichler, *"Hellenismus" Geschichte und Problematik eines Epochenbegriffs* (Darmstadt, 1983).
Elias J. Bickerman, "The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther" *JBL* 63 (1944), 339–362.
———, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas" *ZNW* 29 (1930), 280–298.
———, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, MA, 1988).
———, "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther" *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 20 (1950), 101–133.
R.A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley, 1990).

———, *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism* (Leiden, 1995).
Peter Bing, "Posidippus and the Admiral: Kallikrates of Samos in the Milan Epigrams" *GRBS* 43 (2002/3), 243–266.
Jean Bingen, "Une double date au début du règne de Ptolémée II Philadelphe (stèle de Pithom, ligne 7)" *ChrÉg* 18 (1943), 138–147.
———, "Posidippe: le poète et les princes" in Violetta De Angelis (ed.), *Un poeta ritrovato: Posidippo di Pella: giornata di studio: Milano, 23 novembre 2001* (Milan, 2002), 47–59.
———, review of W. Müller, *Papyrusurkunden aus ptolemäischer Zeit*: *ChrÉg* 51 (1976), 185–187.
Phyllis A. Bird, *Missing Persons and Mistaken Identities: Women and Gender in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis, 1997).
Aylward M. Blackman and Herbert W. Fairman, "The Myth of Horus at Edfu—II" Three parts: *JEA* 28 (1942), 32–38; *JEA* 29 (1943), 2–36; *JEA* 30 (1944), 5–22.
Aylward M. Blackman, *The Story of King Kheops and the Magicians: Transcribed from Papyrus Westcar (Berlin Papyrus 3033)* (Reading, 1988).
Andreas Blasius and Bernd U. Schipper (eds.), *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (Leuven, 2002 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 107]).
Adrien Janis Bledstein, "Was HABBIRYÂ a Healing Ritual Performed by a Woman in King David's House?" *Biblical Research* 37 (1992). 15–31.
Elke Blumenthal, "Die Erzählung des Papyrus d'Orbiney als Literaturwerk" *ZÄS* 99 (1973), 1–17.
John Boardman, see Donna C. Kurtz.
Martin Bommas, *Heiligtum und Mysterium: Griechenland und seine ägyptischen Gottheiten* (Mainz, 2005).
Philipppe Borgeaud and Youri Volokhine, "La formation de la légende de Sarapis: une approche transculturelle" *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000), 37–76.
J.F. Borghouts, *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts* (Leiden, 1978 [= *Nisaba*, 9]).
A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides* (4 vols., Paris, 1903–1907).
J. Bousquet, "Lettre de Ptolémée Evergète à Xanthos de Lycie" *RÉG* 99 (1986), 22–32.
J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: an Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge, 1969).
Alan K. Bowman and Eugene Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*. (Oxford, 1999 [= Proceedings of the British Academy 96]).
Alan K. Bowman, *Egypt after the Pharaohs: 332 BC–AD 642: from Alexander to the Arab Conquest* (London, 1986).
Thomas Allan Brady, *Sarapis and Isis: Collected Essays* (Chicago, 1978).
David Braund, "After Alexander: the Emergence of the Hellenistic World, 323–281" in Andrew Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Malden and Oxford, 2003).
———, *Georgia in Antiquity: a History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia, 550 BC–AD562* (Oxford, 1994).
Edda Bresciani, "La spedizione di Tolomeo II in Siria in un ostrakon demotico

inedito da Karnak" in Herwig Maehler and Volker Michael Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz, 1978), 31–37.

———, "Registrazione catastale e ideologia del politica nell'Egitto tolemaico. A completamento di 'La spedizione di Tolomeo II in Siria in un ostrakon demotico inedito da Karnak'" *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 6 (1983), 15–31.

Pierre Briant, *Histoire de l'Empire perse: de Cyrus à Alexandr*e (Paris, 1996).

Klaus Bringmann, "The King as Benefactor" in Anthony Bulloch, Erich Gruen, A.A. Long and A. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1993 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 12]), 7–24.

———, see also W. Ameling.

S.P. Brock, "Aspects of translation technique in antiquity" *GRBS* 20 (1979), 69–87.

———, "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation" in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *LXX Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Atlanta, GA, 1992 [= Septuagint and Cognate Studies monograph series, 33]), 306–308.

William P. Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek texts of Genesis 1.1–2.3* (Atlanta, 1993 [= Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 132]).

Heinrich Brugsch, "Le Roman de Setnau contenu dans un papyrus démotique du Musée égyptien à Boulaq." *RA* third series 16 (1867), 161–179.

———, *Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacorum* (Leipzig, 1884).

P. Brun, "Les Lagides à Lesbos: Essai de Chronologie" *ZPE* 85 (1991), 99–113.

P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris, 1970 [= Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 217]).

———, "Le dromos et le temple C du Sarapieion C de Délos" *BCH* 104 (1980) 161–188.

Anthony Bulloch, Erich Gruen, A.A. Long and A. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1993 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 12]).

Kostas Buraselis, "Ambivalent Roles of Centre and Periphery: Remarks on the Relation of the Cities of Greece with the Ptolemies until the End of Philometor's Age", in Per Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, K. Randsborg and J. Zahle (eds.), *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of an International Colloquium held at Fuglsang Manor, Lolland, Denmark, in March 1992* (Aarhus, 1993 [= Studies in Hellenistic Civilization, 4]), 251–270.

———, "Zu BCH 1975, 52–53" *Archaiologike Ephemeris* (1982), 136–160.

———, *Das Hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis: Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden (Antigonos Monopthalmos, Demetrios Poliorketes und Antigonos Gonatas) im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien* (Munich, 1982 [= Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 73]).

———, "Kronprinzentum und Realpolitik. Bemerkungen zur Thronanwartschaft, Mitregentschaft und Thronfolge unter den ersten vier Ptolemäern"

in Victor Alonso Troncoso (ed.) Διάδοχος τῆς βασιλείας (Madrid, 2005 [= *Gerión* supplement 9]), 91–102.
Günter Burkard, *Spätzeitliche Osiris-Liturgien im Corpus der Asasif-Papyri* (Wiesbaden, 1995 [= Ägypten und Altes Testament, 31]).
Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA, 1985).
Stanley M. Burstein (ed. and trans.), *Agatharchides of Cnidus: On the Erythraean Sea* (London, 1989).
———, "Arsinoë II Philadelphus: a Revisionist View" in W.L. Adams and E.N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Lanham, 1982), 197–212.
———, "Exploration and Ethnography in Ptolemaic Egypt" *Ancient World* 31 (2000), 31–37.
———, *Graeco-Africana: Studies in the History of Greek Relations with Egypt and Nubia* (New Rochelle, 1995).
———, *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Kleopatra VII* (Cambridge, 1985 [= Translated Documents of Greece and Rome, 3]).
———, "The Hellenistic Fringe: the Case of Meroë" in Peter Green (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1993 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 9]), 38–66.
———, "Ivory and Ptolemaic Exploration of the Red Sea: the Missing Factor" *ΤΟΠΟΙ* 6 (1996), 799–807.
———, "Lysimachus and the Greek Cities of Asia: the Case of Miletus" *Ancient World* 3 (1980), 73–79.
A. Burton, *Diodorus Siculus Book 1: a Commentary* (Leiden, 1972 [= Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 29]).
G.W. Butterworth, *Clement of Alexandria with an English Translation* (London, 1919).
Calvin S. Byre, *A Reading of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica: the Poetics of Uncertainty* (Lewiston and Lampeter, 2002).
M. Caccamo Caltabiano, "Berenice II. Il ruolo di una *basilissa* rivelato dalle sue monete" in Enzo Catani and Silvia Maria Marengo (eds.), *La Cirenaica in età antica: atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata, 18–20 maggio 1995* (Pisa and Rome, 1998), 97–112.
H. Cadell, "A quelle date Arsinoé Philadelphe est-elle décedée?" in Henri Melaerts (ed.), *Le Culte du souverain dans l'Egypte ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère: actes du colloque international, Bruxelles, 10 mai 1995* (Leuven, 1998 [= Studia Hellenistica, 34]).
Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972).
Alan Cameron, "Asclepiades' Girl Friends" in Helene P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York, 1981), 275–322.
———, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995).
———, "Two Mistresses of Ptolemy Philadelphus" *GRBS* 31 (1990), 287–311.
Ricardo A. Caminos, *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon* (Rome, 1958 [= Analecta Orientalia, 37]).
Claudia V. Camp, "Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem through the Eyes of Ben Sira" in Amy-Jill Levine (ed.), *Women*

Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman Period (Atlanta, 1991 [= Early Judaism and Its Literature, 1]), 1–39.
Malcolm Campbell, *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica III.1–471* (Leiden, 1994 [= *Mnemosyne* supplement 141]).
L. Canfora, *Ellenismo* (Rome, 1987).
Eva Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* (New Haven and London, 1992).
Mario Capasso and P. Davoli (eds), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum* (Lecce, 2005 [= Papyrologica Lupiensia, 14]).
P. Cappelletto (ed.), *I frammenti di Mnasea: Introduzione testo e commento* (Milan, 2003 [= Università degli Studi di Milano, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, 209, Sezione di filologia classica]).
J.-F. Carlotti, see C. Sambin.
Elizabeth D. Carney, "Arsinoë before she was Philadelphus" *Ancient History Bulletin* 8.4 (1994), 123–131.
———, "Hunting and the Macedonian elite: Sharing the Rivalry of the Chase" in Daniel Ogden (ed.), *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives* (London, 2002), 59–80.
———, "The Reappearance of Royal Sibling Marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt" *PP* 42 (1987), 420–439.
Paul Cartledge and Antony Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: a Tale of Two Cities* (London and New York, 1989).
Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey and Erich Gruen (eds.), *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1997 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 26]).
Max Cary, *History of the Greek World from 323 BC to 146 BC* (second edition, London, 1951).
Lionel Casson, "A Petrie Papyrus and the Battle of Raphia" *BASP* 30 (1993), 87–92.
———, "Ptolemy II and the Hunting of African Elephants" *TAPA* 123 (1993), 247–260.
L. Castiglione, "Nouvelles données archéologiques concernant la génèse du culte de Sarapis" in Margreet B. de Boer and T.A. Edridge (eds.), *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren: recueil d'études offert par les auteurs de la série 'Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain' à Maarten J. Vermaseren à l'occasion de son soixantème anniversaire le 7 avril* (Leiden, 1978 [= Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 68]), 208–232.
Françoise de Cenival, *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques* (Cairo, 1972).
———, *Le Mythe de l'oeil du soleil: translittération et traduction avec commentaire philologique* (Sommerhausen, 1988 [= Demotische Studien, 9]).
J. Cerný, "Consanguineous Marriages in Pharaonic Egypt" *JEA* 40 (1954), 23–29.
Mortimer Chambers, "The First Regnal Year of Antigonus Gonatas" *AJP* 75.4 (1954), 385–394.
F. Chamoux, "Epigramme de Cyrène en l'honneur du roi Magas" *BCH* 82 (1958), 571–587.

———, "L'épigramme de Poseidippos sur le phare d'Alexandrie" in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergael (eds.), *Le monde grec: pensée, littérature, histoire, documents. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 214–222.
———, "Le roi Magas" *Revue Historique* 216 (1956), 18–34.
Angelos Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World: a Social and Cultural History* (Oxford, 2005).
R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (2 vols., Oxford, 1913).
J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, 4A: Pseudepigraphic and non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers (Tübingen, 1997).
———, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London, 1983).
P. Charvet and J. Yoyotte (eds.), *Strabon, Le Voyage en Egypte: un regard romain* (Paris, 1997).
Émile Chassinat, *Le mystère d'Osiris au mois de Khoiak* (2 volumes, Cairo, 1966 and 1968).
———, *Le temple de Dendara* (Cairo, 1934).
———, *Le Temple d'Edfou* vol. 6 (Cairo, 1931 [= Mémoires (Mission archéologique française au Caire), 23]).
Seymour Chatman, *Coming to Terms: the Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca and London, 1990).
Michel Chauveau, "Ptolemée II Philadelphe" in C. Jacob and F. de Polignac (eds.), *Alexandrie, IIIème siècle av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1992), 138–151.
Thorolf Christensen, *The Edfu nome surveyed: P.Haun. inv. 407 (119–118 BC)* (Diss. Cambridge, 2002).
Marshall Clagett, *Ancient Egyptian Science: a Source Book* (3 vols., Philadelphia, 1992).
R.J. Clare, *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery, and Narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Cambridge, 2002).
Willy Clarysse and Dorothy J. Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2006).
Willy Clarysse and G. van der Veken (1983), *The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Leiden, 1983 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 24]).
Willy Clarysse, "Harmachis, Agent of the *oikonomos*: an Archive from the Time of Philopator" *Ancient Society* 7 (1976), 186–207.
———, "Philadelpheia and the Memphites in the Zenon Archive" in Dorothy J. Crawford, Jan Quaegebeur, Willy Clarysse (eds.), *Studies on Ptolemaic Memphis* (Leuven, 1980 [= Studia Hellenistica, 24]), 91–122.
Willy Clarysse and Katelijn Vandorpe, "The Ptolemaic apomoira" in Henri Melaerts (ed.), *Le culte du souverain dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles, 10 mai 1995* (Leuven, 1998 [= Studia Hellenistica, 34]), 5–42.
Willy Clarysse, "Toponymy of Fayyum villages in the Ptolemaic Period" in Mario Capasso and P. Davoli (eds), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum* (Lecce, 2005 [= Papyrologica Lupiensia, 14]), 67–81.
Willy Clarysse and Katelijn Vandorpe, *Zenon, un homme d'affaires grec à l'ombre des pyramides* (Leuven, 1995 [= Ancorae, 14]).

James J. Clauss, *The Best of the Argonauts: the Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book 1 of Apollonius's Argonautica* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1993).

———, "Conquest of the Mephistophelian Nausicaa: Medea's Role in Apollonius' Redefinition of the Epic Hero" in James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnson (eds.), *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art* (Princeton, 1997), 149–177.

Ronald E. Clements, *Wisdom for a Changing World: Wisdom in Old Testament Theology* (Berkeley, 1990 [= Berkeley Lectures, 2]).

Charles Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine during the years 1873–1874* (vol. 2, London, 1896).

P. Cloché, "La politique extérieure de Lacédémone depuis la mort d'Agis III jusqu'à celle d'Acrotatos, fils d'Areus Ier" *RÉA* 43 (1946), 29–61.

Marc Coenen, "New Stanzas of the *Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys*" *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 31 (2000–2005), 5–23.

Getzel M. Cohen, *The Seleukid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization* (Wiesbaden, 1978 [= *Historia* Einzelschrift 30]).

J.J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York, 1986).

———, "Cult and Culture: the Limits of Hellenization in Judea" in J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame, 2001), 38–61.

Nina L. Collins, *The Library at Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (Leiden and Boston, 2000 [*Vetus Testamentum* supplement 82]).

Michael T. Compton, "The Association of Hygieia with Asklepios in Graeco-Roman Asklepieion Medicine" *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 57 (2002), 312–329.

C.R. Conder, *The Survey of Western Palestine: memoirs of the topography orography hydrography and archaeology* vol. 3 *Judea* (London, 1883).

A.B. Cook, *Zeus: a Study in Ancient Religion* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1914–1920).

Johann Cook, "Isha zara (Prov 1–9 in the Septuagint) a metaphor for foreign wisdom?" *ZATW* 106 (1994), 458–476.

———, *The Septuagint of Proverbs—Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden, 1997 [= *Vetus Testamentum* supplement 69]).

———, "Greek Philosophy and the Septuagint" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 24.1 (1998), 177–191.

———, "The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs" *Vetus Testamentum* 49.4 (1999), 448–461.

———, "Ideology and Translation Technique—Two Sides of the Same Coin?" in Raija Sollamo and S. Sipilä (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (Göttingen, 2001), 195–210.

———, "The translator(s) of LXX Proverbs" *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 7 (2002), 1–50. http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/Cook2002.html (6 November 2006).

———, "Law and Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls with Reference to Hellenistic Judaism" in Florentino García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (Leuven, 2003

[= Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 168]), 323–342.
———, "The Greek of Proverbs—Evidence of a Recensionally Deviating Hebrew Text?" in S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden, 2003), 605–618.
———, "Exegesis in the Septuagint" *JNSL* 30/1 (2004), 1–19.
———, "The origin of the tradition of the יצר הטוב and יצר הרע" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007), 80–91.
Frederick A. Cooper, *The Temple of Apollo at Bassai: a Preliminary Study* (New York and London, 1978).
Frederick A. Cooper (ed.), *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas*, vol. 1 (Princeton, 1996).
Frederick A. Copleston, *History of Philosophy* vol. 1: *Greece and Rome* part 1 (Garden City, 1962).
Francis M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology* (London, 1937).
J.P. Corteggiani, in Nicolas Grimal, Pierre Briant, Michel Chauveau et al (eds.), *Exposition: Musée du Petit Palais La gloire d'Alexandrie. 7 mai – 26 juillet 1998* (Paris, 1998).
Jonas Crampa, *Labraunda: Swedish excavations and researches* (vol. 3.1, Lund, 1969).
Dorothy J. Crawford, *Kerkeosiris: an Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period* (Cambridge, 1971).
———, "Ptolemy, Ptah and Apis in Hellenistic Memphis" in Dorothy J. Crawford, Jan Quaegebeur, Willy Clarysse (eds.), *Studies on Ptolemaic Memphis* (Leuven, 1980 [= Studia Hellenistica, 24]), 1–42.
Lucia Criscuolo, "Agoni e politica alla corte di Alessandria. Riflessioni su alcuni epigrammi di Posidippo" *Chiron* 33 (2003), 311–333.
———, "Considerazioni generali sull' epiteto ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΣ nelle dinastie ellenistiche e sulla sua applicazione nella titolatura degli ultimi seleucidi" *Historia* 43 (1994), 402–422.
———, "Il dieceta Apollonios e Arsinoe" in Henri Melaerts (ed.), *Le culte du souverain dans l'Egypte ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère. Actes du Colloque international, Bruxelles, 10 mai 1995* (Leuven, 1998 [= Studia Hellenistica, 34]), 61–72.
———, "*Philadelphos* nella dinastia lagide" *Aegyptus* 70 (1990), 89–96.
Jean Daniélou, *Philon d'Alexandrie: les temps et les destines* (Paris, 1958).
Ephraim David, *Sparta between Empire and Revolution: Internal Problems and their Impact on Contemporary Greek Consciousness* (Salem, 1981).
James N. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: the Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (London, 1997).
J.K. Davies, *Democracy and Classical Greece* (London, 1978).
———, "Hellenistic Economies in the post-Finley Era" in Zofia H. Archibald et al. (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies* (London and New York, 2001), 11–62.
P.R. Davies, "Post-exilic Collections and the Formation of the Canon" in J.W. Rogerson and P.R. Davies (eds.), *The Old Testament World* (Cambridge, 1989), 360–375.
———, *Scribes and Schools* (London, 1998).
Paola Davoli, see Mario Capasso.

Emile Delage, see Francis Vian.
Nancy Demand, "Monuments, Midwives and Gynaecology" in P.J. van der Eijk, H.F.J. Horstmanshoff and P.H. Schrijvers (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context: Papers Read at the Congress Held at Leiden University, 13–15 April, 1992* (2 vols., Atlanta, 1995 [= Clio medica, 27–28]), 275–290.
Alexander Demandt, "Hellenismus—die moderne Zeit des Altertums?" in B. Funcke (ed.), *Hellenismus* (Tübingen, 1996) 17–27.
Mark Depauw and Mark Smith, "Visions of Ecstasy: Cultic Revelry before the goddess Ai/Nahemainit: Ostraca Faculteit Letteren (K.U. Leuven) dem. 1–2" in Friedhelm Hoffmann and Heinz J. Thissen (eds.), *Res Severa Verum Gaudium: Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juni 2004* (Leuven, 2004 [Studia Demotica, 6]), 67–93.
Philippe Derchain, "La garde 'égyptienne' de Ptolémée II" *ZPE* 65 (1986), 203–204.
———, *Le Papyrus Salt 825 (BM10051): rituel pour la conservation de la vie en Egypte* (Brussels, 1965).
Jehan Desanges, "Les chasseurs d'éléphants du Abou-Simbel" *Actes du 92e Congrès national sociétés savantes, Strasbourg et Colmar 1967, Section d'archéologie* (Paris, 1970).
———, *Recherches sur l'activité des méditerranéens aux confins de l'Afrique* (Paris, 1978).
Jacco Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites: the London-Leiden Magical Manuscripts and Translation in Egyptian Ritual (100–300 CE)* (Leiden, 2005 [= Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 153]).
Gertrud Dietze, "Philae und die Dodekaschoinos in Ptolemäischer Zeit" *Ancient Society* 25 (1994), 63–110.
Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York, 1987 [= Anchor Bible, 39]).
Devorah Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: text, translation, reading and interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in ancient Judaism and early Christianity* (Assen and Minneapolis, 1988 [= Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.1]), 379–419.
Ludwig Dindorf, see Henricus Stephanus.
Jennifer M. Dines and Michael A. Knibb, *The Septuagint* (London and New York, 2004).
W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, MA, 1931).
———, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York, 1934).
W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum* (third edition, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1915–1924).
Marc Domingo Gygax, "Zum Mitregenten des Ptolemaios II. Philadelphos" *Historia* 51.1. (2002), 49–56.
G. Dorival, M. Harl and O. Munnich, *La bible grecque des Septante: du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris, 1994).
Thomas M. Dousa, "Imagining Isis: On some Continuities and Discontinuities in the Image of Isis in Greek Isis Hymns and Demotic Texts" in Kim Ryholt

(ed.), *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies, Copenhagen, 23–27 August 1999* (Copenhagen, 2002 [= CNI Publications, 27]), 149–184.
Ken Dowden, "Alexander Romance" in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1989), 650–735.
Boris Dreyer, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen* (Stuttgart, 1999 [= *Historia* Einzelschrift 137]).
Pierre Ducrey, *Warfare in Ancient Greece* (New York, 1985).
Michael W. Duggan, *The Covenant Renewal in Ezra-Nehemiah* (Atlanta, 2001).
Françoise Dunand, *Catalogue des terres cuites gréco-romaines d'Egypte* (Paris, 1990).
———, *Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la méditerranée I. Le culte d'Isis et les Ptolémées* (Leiden, 1973 [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain, 26]).
———, "Une 'pseudo-baubo' du Musée de Besançon" in Hélène Walter (ed.) *Hommages à Lucien Lerat* (Paris, 1984 [= Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, 294]), 263–270.
———, "Le syncrétisme isiaque à la fin de l'époque hellénistique" in *Les syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine, Colloque de Strasbourg (9–11 juin 1971)* (Paris, 1973), 79–93.
Ruth Duttenhöfer, *Ptolemäische Urkunden aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung (P. Heid. VI)*. (Heidelberg, 1994 [= Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung, neue Folge, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 7]).
C.C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri* (4 vols., Cairo, 1925–1931).
———, "Selected Papyri from the Archives of Zenon (Nos. 37–48): No. 46" *ASAE* 19 (1920), 81–104.
Brigitte Egger, "Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe" in J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: the Greek Novel in Context* (London, 1994), 31–48.
Tormod Eide et al., *Fontes historiae Nubiorum: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*, vol. 2 (Bergen, 1996).
Norbert Elias, *The Court Society* (Oxford, 1983; originally published Darmstadt, 1969).
C.W. Eliot, see J.E. Jones.
Jean-Yves Empereur, *Alexandria Rediscovered* (London, 1998).
Helmut Engelmann, *The Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis* (Leiden, 1975).
Åke Engsheden, *La reconstitution du verbe en égyptien de tradition 400–30 avant J.-C* (Uppsala, 2003 [= Uppsala Studies in Egyptology, 3]).
Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* (7 vols., Leipzig, 1926–1963).
R.M. Errington, *A History of Macedonia* (Berkeley, 1990).
Andrew Erskine, "Culture and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: the Museum and Library of Alexandria" *Greece and Rome* 42.1 (1995), 38–48.
J. Worth Estes, *The Medical Skills of Ancient Egypt* (Canton, MA, 1989).
R. Etienne and M. Piérart (1975), "Un décret du Koinon des Hellènes à Platées en l'honneur de Glaucon, fils d'Etéoclès d'Athènes" *BCH* 99 (1975), 51–75.
Herbert W. Fairman, *The Triumph of Horus: an Ancient Egyptian Sacred Drama* (London, 1974).
Maria Rosaria Falivene, "Government, Management, Literacy: Aspects of

Ptolemaic Administration in the Early Hellenistic Period" *Ancient Society* 22 (1991), 203–227.
———, *The Herakleopolite Nome: a Catalogue of the Toponyms* (Atlanta, 1998 [= American Studies in Papyrology 37]).
———, "The Herakleopolite Nome: Internal and External Borders" in Adam Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen, 23–29 August, 1992* (Copenhagen, 1994), 203–209.
———, "The Literary Papyri from Al-Hiba: a New Approach" in Bärbel Kramer (ed.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13.–19.8. 1995*, (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997 [= *ArchPF* Beiheft 3 Band 1]), 273–280.
M. Fantuzzi, "Posidippus at Court: the Contribution of the Ἱππικά of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 to the Ideology of Ptolemaic Kingship" in Kathryn J. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidipppus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book* (Oxford, 2005) 249–268.
———, "The Structure of the *Hippika* in P.Mil.Vogl. viii 309" in Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)* (Cambridge, MA, 2004 [= Hellenic Studies, 2]), 212–224.
Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2004).
Raymond O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts* (3 vols., Warminster, 1973–1978).
———, "The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus—I" *JEA* 22 (1936), 121–140.
———, "The Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys" in *Mélanges Maspero* 1, *Orient Ancient* (Cairo, 1935), 337–348 and plates 1–4.
———, *The Papyrus Bremner-Rhind (British Museum no. 10188)* (Brussels, 1933 [= Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 3]).
Wolfgang Fauth, "Sarapis-Exkurs (Tac. Hist. 83–84)" in Heinz Heubner (ed.), *P. Cornelius Tacitus: die Historien* (vol. 4, Heidelberg, 1976), 184–206.
Denis C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991).
Heinz Felber, "Die demotische Chronik" in Andreas Blasius and Bernd U. Schipper (eds.), *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (Leuven, 2002 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 107]), 65–111.
W.S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, MA, 1932).
———, "Egypt's Loss of Sea Power" *JHS* 30 (1910), 189–208.
———, *Hellenistic Athens* (London, 1911).
N. Fernández Marcos, review of N. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria* (Leiden as Boston, 2000): *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 33 (2002), 97–101.
———, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden, Boston and Köln, 2000).
J.-G. Février, *La date, la composition et les sources de la Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (Paris, 1925 [Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, 242]).
Nick Fields, "Et ex Arcadia ego" *Ancient History Bulletin* 15 (2001), 102–138.
John V.A. Fine, *The Ancient Greeks: a Critical History* (Cambridge, MA, 1983).
———, review of Giuseppe Nenci, *Pirro: Aspirazioni egemoniche ed equilibrio mediterraneo* (Turin, 1953): *AJP* 78.1 (1957), 108–111.

Marjorie Fisher, *The Sons of Ramesses II* (2 vols., Wiesbaden, 2001 [= Ägypten und Altes Testament, 53]).
M.P.V. Fitzgerald, see R.A. Hazzard.
H.L. Fleischer, see Jacob Levy.
P.W. Flint, "The Shape of the 'Bible' at Qumran" in J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: a Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls, vol. 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* (Leiden, 2001), 45–103.
Victoria Foertmeyer, "The Dating of the Pompe of Ptolemy II Philadelphus" *Historia* 37.1 (1988), 90–104.
Paul Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris, 1914).
Eric Foulon, "*Misthophoroi* et *xenoi* hellenistiques" *RÉG* 108 (1995), 211–218.
Hermann Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich, 1968).
David Frankfurter, "Narrating Power: the Theory and Practice of the Magical *Historiola* in Ritual Spells" in Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki (eds.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (Leiden, 1995 [= Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 129]), 457–476.
Alfred Frazer, *The Propylon of Ptolemy II* (Princeton, 1990 [= Bollingen Series, 60, and Samothrace, 10]).
J.G. Frazer (trans.), *Pausanias' Description of Greece* (6 vols., London, 1898).
P.M. Fraser, appendix to Arnaldo Momigliano, "A New Date for the Battle of Andros? A Discussion" *CQ* 44 (1950), 107–118, at 116–118.
P.M. Fraser and C.H. Roberts, "A New Letter of Apollonius" *ChrÉg* 24 (1949). 289–294
P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols., Oxford, 1972).
———, "A Ptolemaic Inscription in the Alexandria Museum" *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie* 41 (1956) 49–55.
———, "Two Studies on the Cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic World" *Opuscula Atheniensia* 3 (1960), 1–54.
M.W. Frederiksen, see F.W. Walbank.
Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *In the Wake of the Goddesses: Women, Culture, and the Biblical Transformation of Pagan Myth* (New York, 1992).
J.J. Gabbert, "The Anarchic Dating of the Chremonidean War" *CJ* 82 (1986), 230–235.
———, *Antigonus II Gonatas*. (London and New York, 1997).
Vincent Gabrielsen, *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations*, (Baltimore and London, 1995).
Kathy L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity* (Berkeley, 2003 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 40]).
Michael Gagarin, *Early Greek Law* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1986).
Alan H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum* (London, 1935).
———, *Late-Egyptian Stories* (Brussels, 1932 [= Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, 1]).
Robert Garland, *The Piraeus: from the Fifth to the First Century BC* (London, 1987).
François Gaudard, *The Demotic Drama of Horus and Seth (P. Berlin 8278a, b, c; 15662; 15818; 23536; 23537a, b, c, d, e, f, g)* (Diss. Chicago, 2005).

B. George, "Ptolemaios II und Arsinoe II vor den Göttern von Athribis" *Medelhavsmuseet Bulletin* 17 (1982), 11–16.
G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint III, Proverbs* (Lund, 1956 [= Lunds Universitets Arsskrift N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 52. Nr. 3]).
Giuseppe Giangrande, review of P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, *JHS* 94 (1974), 233–235.
Sheila Gibson, see Judith S. McKenzie.
E.H. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri* XV, vol. 3 part 2 (London, 1903).
Robyn A. Gillam, *Performance and Drama in Ancient Egypt* (London, 2005).
Stephen R.K. Glanville, *The Instructions of 'Onchsheshonqy: British Museum Papyrus 10508* (London, 1955 [= Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum, 2]).
Hans Goedicke, "Palestine in the Early Third Century BC" *Varia Aegyptiaca* 5 (1989), 194–202.
Sara Goldbrunner, *Der verblendete Gelehrte*: *Der erste Setna-Roman (P. Kairo 30646)*: *Umschrift, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Demotische Studien 13. Sommerhausen, Germany: Gisela Zauzich Verlag, 2006.
Simon Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge, 1991).
Farouk Gomaà, *Chaemwese: Sohn Ramses' II. und Hoherpriester von Memphis* (Wiesbaden, 1973 [= Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, 27]).
———, "Herakleopolis Magna" in Wolfgang Helck und Eberhard Otto (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (vol. 2, Wiesbaden, 1977), 1124–1127.
Matthew Paul Gonzales, "Eumenes I and his Soldiers Reconsidered" *Journal of Associated Graduates in Near Eastern Studies* 8.1 (1998), 12–18 (www.jagnes.com/vol08.html).
Richard L. Gordon, review of Reinhold Merkelbach, *Isis regina, Zeus Sarapis: die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Stuttgart, 1995) *JRS* 86 (1996), 233–234.
A. Goshen-Gottstein, "Ben Sira's Praise of the Fathers: a Canon-conscious Reading" in R. Egger-Wenzel (ed.), *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham, Ushaw College, 2001* (Berlin, 2002), 235–267.
A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1965).
A.S.F. Gow, *Machon* (Cambridge, 1965).
———, *Theocritus* (second edition, 2 vols., Oxford, 1952).
Sir William Gowers, "African Elephants and Ancient Authors" *African Affairs* 47 (1948), 173–180.
Jean-Claude Goyon, "Le cérémonial de glorification d'Osiris du Papyrus du Louvre I. 3079 (colonnes 110 à 112)" *BIFAO* 65 (1967), 89–156.
———, "Hededyt: Isis-scorpion et Isis au scorpion. En marge du Papyrus de Brooklyn 47.218.50—III" *BIFAO* 78 (1978), 439–458.
———, *Le Papyrus d'Imouthès, fils de Psintaes au Metropolitan Museum of Art de New-York (Papyrus MMA 35.9.21)* (New York, 1999).
Jean-Claude Goyon (ed.), *Rituels funéraires de l'ancienne Égypte: le rituel de l'em-*

baumement, le rituel de l'ouverture de la bouche, les livres des respirations (Paris, 1972 [= Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 4]).
J.E. Grabe, *The History of the Seventy-two Interpreters* (London, 1715).
N.L. Grač, "Otkrytie novogo istoričeskogo istočnika v Nimfee (Predvaritel'noe soobščenie)" [= "Discovery of a new historical source at Nymphea"] *VDI* 167 (1984), 81–88 [with English summary and illustrations].
John D. Grainger, *Hellenistic Phoenicia* (Oxford, 1991).
Yves Grandjean, *Une nouvelle arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée.* (Leiden, 1975 [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain]).
Michael Grant, *From Alexander to Cleopatra: the Hellenistic World* (New York, 1982).
Hermann Grapow, see Adolf Erman.
Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium: the Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley, 1990).
Peter Green (trans.), *The Argonautika by Apollonios Rhodios* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1997 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 25]).
Peter Green, "'These fragments have I shored against my ruins': Apollonios Rhodios and the Social Revalidation of Myth for a New Age" in Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey and Erich Gruen (eds.), *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1997 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 26]), 35–71.
Peter Green (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1993 [Hellenistic Culture and Society, 9]).
Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (vol. 11, London, 1915).
Francis Llewellyn Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis: the Sethon of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas* (Oxford, 1900).
Francis Llewellyn Griffith and Herbert Thompson, *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden* (3 vols., London, 1904–1909).
G.T. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge, 1935).
———, see also W.W. Tarn.
Frederick T. Griffiths, *Theocritus at Court* (Leiden, 1979).
J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Apuleius of Madauros, The Isis Book* (*Metamorphoses, Book XI*) (Leiden, 1975 [= Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain 39]).
———, 'The Concept of Divine Judgement in the Mystery Religions' in U. Bianchi and M.J. Vermaseren, *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero romano: Atti del Colloquio internazionale, Roma, 24–28 settembre 1979.* (Leiden, 1982), 192–222.
———, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth from Egyptian and Classical Sources* (Liverpool, 1960).
J. Gwyn Griffiths (ed. and trans.), *Plutarch* De Iside et Osiride (Cardiff, 1970).
J. Gwyn Griffiths, "Isis as Ma'at, Dikaiosune, and Iustitia" in Catherine Berger, Gisèle Clerc and Nicolas Grimal (eds.), *Hommages à Jean Leclant vol. 3, Études isiaques*, (Cairo, 1994 [= Bibliothèque d'Étude 106, no. 3]), 255–264.
Nicolas Grimal, *Histoire de l'Égypte ancienne* (Paris, 1988).
———, *Les termes de la propagande royale égyptienne de la XIXe dynastie à la conquête*

d'Alexandre (Paris, 1986 [= Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, nouvelle série 6]).
Günter Grimm, *Alexandria. Die erste Königsstadt der hellenistischen Welt. Bilder aus der Nilmetropole von Alexander dem Großen bis Kleopatra VII* (Mainz, 1998).
———, "Zur Ptolemäeraltar aus dem alexandrinischen Sarapeion" in *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano. Studi in onore di Achille Adriani* (vol. 1, Rome, 1983 [= Studi e Materiali. Ist. di archeol. Univ. di Palermo, 4]), 70–73.
Günter Grimm and D. Wildung, *Götter Pharaonen* (Mainz, 1987).
Erich Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA, 2002).
———, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (2 vols., Berkeley, 1984).
———, see also Anthony Bulloch.
Erhard Grzybek, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaique: problèmes de chronologie hellénistique* (Basel, 1990).
Philippe Guillaume, *Waiting for Josiah: the Judges* (London, 2004).
———, "New Light on the Nebiim from Alexandria: a Chronography to Replace the Deuteronomistic History" *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5 (2004) http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_39.pdf (8 November 2006).
Max Guilmot, *Les initiés et les rites initiatiques en Egypte ancienne* (Paris, 1977)
C.B. Gulick (trans.), *Athenaeus* (seven vols., Cambridge, MA, 1927–1941 [Loeb Classical Library]).
Kathryn J. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidipppus: a Hellenistic Poetry Book* (Oxford, 2005).
Wolfgang Habermann, "Zur chronologischen Verteilung der papyrologischen Zeugnisse" *ZPE* 122 (1998), 144–160.
Christian Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge, MA, 1997).
———, "Athens and the Ptolemies" *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992), 68–90.
———, "Bemerkungen zum P.Haun. 6" *ZPE* 39 (1980), 1–5.
———, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte* (München, 1956).
———, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte* (second edition, Munich, 1970).
Christian Habicht and C.P. Jones, "A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia" *Phoenix* 43 (1989), 317–346.
Christian Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1998).
———, "Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit" *Mitteilungen des deutschen archaölogischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 72 (1957), 152–274.
———, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr* (Munich, 1979 [= *Vestigia*, 30]).
Noah Hacham, "The *Letter of Aristeas*: a New Exodus Story?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 36.1 (2005), 1–20.
Moses Hadas, "Aristeas and III Maccabees" *Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949), 175–184.
———, *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (New York, 1951).
Fayza Mohamed Hussein Haikal, *Two Hieratic Funerary Papyri of Nesmin* (2 vols., Brussels, 1970 and 1972 [= Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, 14 and 15]).
David M. Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (New Haven, 1983).
N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 BC* (Oxford, 1959).

N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* (3 vols., Oxford, 1988).
N.G.L. Hammond, "What may Philip have Learnt as a Hostage in Thebes?" *GRBS* 38.4 (1997), 355–372.
———, "Which Ptolemy Gave Troops and Stood as Protector of Pyrrhus' Kingdom?" *Historia* 37.4 (1988), 405–413.
David-Marc d'Hamonville, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, 17: Les Proverbes. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante* (Paris, 2000).
Peter Handrock, *Dienstliche Weisungen in den Papyri der Ptolemäerzeit* (Diss. Cologne, 1967).
Jean Hani, *La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque* (Paris, 1976).
Esther V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* (second edition, Ithaca and London, 1971 [= Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 36]).
Richard Harder, *Karpokrates von Chalkis und die memphitische Isispropaganda* (Berlin, 1944 [= Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1943, 14]).
Alexander Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae* (Liverpool, 1983).
Philip R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986).
M. Harl, see G. Dorival.
Daniel Harrington, "Sirach" in William R. Farmer (ed.), *The International Bible Commentary: a Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century* (Collegeville, 1998), 923–950.
———, "Sirach Research since 1965" in John C. Reeves and John Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Sheffield, 1994), 164–176.
Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos, "'L'histoire par les noms' in Macedonia" in Simon Hornblower and Elaine Matthews (eds.), *Greek Personal Names: their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000 [= *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 104]), 99–107.
Hans Hauben, "Agathocleia and her Boats" *ZPE* 16 (1975), 288–291.
———, "Arsinoé II et la politique extérieure de l'Egypte" in E. van 't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic world: proceedings of the international colloquium, Leuven, 24–26 May 1982* (Louvain, 1983 [= Studia Hellenistica, 27]), 99–127.
———, "Aspects du culte des souverains à l'époque des Lagides" in Lucia Criscuolo and G. Geraci (eds.), *Egitto e Storia Antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Atti del Colloquio internazionale: Bologna, 31 agosto – 2 settembre 1987* (Bologna, 1989), 441–467.
———, *Callicrates of Samos: a Contribution to the Study of the Ptolemaic Admiralty* (Louvain, 1970 [= Studia Hellenistica, 18]).
———, "La chronologie macédonienne et ptolémaïque mise à l'épreuve: à propos d'un livre d'Erhard Grzybek" *ChrÉg* 67 (1992), 143–171.
Reinhard Häussler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil. 1 Vom Homer zu Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1976).
Katharine Haynes, *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel* (London and New York, 2003).
R.A. Hazzard, "Did Ptolemy I get his Surname from the Rhodians in 304?" *ZPE* 93 (1992), 52–56.

———, *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda* (Toronto, 2000 [= *Phoenix* supplement 37]).
———, *Ptolemaic Coins: an Introduction for Collectors* (Toronto, 1995).
R.A. Hazzard and M.V. Fitzgerald, "The Regulation of the Ptolemaia: a Hypothesis Explored" *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada* 85 (1991), 6–23.
Barclay V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (second edition, Oxford, 1911).
Lisa Heidorn, "The Horses of Kush" *JNES* 56 (1997), 105–115.
Heinz Heinen, "Der κτίστης Boethos und die Einrichtung einer neuen Stadt: Teil II" *ArchPF* 43 (1997), 333–363.
———, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistichen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideischen Krieg* (Wiesbaden, 1972 [= *Historia* Einzelschrift 20]).
Martin Hengel, *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period* (Philadelphia, 1980).
———, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols., London, 1974).
———, "Die Septuaginta als 'christische Schriftensammlung', ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem des Kanons" in Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer (eds.) *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen, 1994), 182–284.
S. Héral, "Archives bilingues de nomarques dans les papyrus de Ghôran" in Janet H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond* (Chicago, 1992 [= Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 51]), 149–157.
Gabriel Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge, 1987).
Marianne Heidenreich, *Christian Gottlob Heyne und die Alte Geschichte* (Munich and Leipzig, 2006).
Christian Gottlob Heyne, "De Genio Saeculi Ptolemaeorum" in his *Opuscula Academica Collecta* (vol. 1, Göttingen, 1785), 76–134.
Cadmus Metcalf Hicks, *Spartan Foreign Relations during the Hellenistic Age*, (Diss. Northwestern, 1980).
Peter Higgs, see Susan Walker.
Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen (ed.), *Thera: Untersuchungen, Vermessungen und Ausgrabungen in den Jahren 1895–1898 I: Die Insel Thera in Altertum und Gegenwart mit Ausschluß der Nekropolen* (Berlin, 1899).
Steven W. Hirsch, *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover and London, 1985).
Sigrid-Eike Hoenes, *Untersuchungen zu Wesen und Kult der Göttin Sachmet* (Bonn, 1976)
Friedhelm Hoffmann, "Der literarische demotische Papyrus Wien D6920–6922" *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 23 (1996), 167–200.
Beate Hofmann, *Die Königsnovelle: 'Strukturanalyse am Einzelwerk'* (Wiesbaden, 2004 [= Ägypten und Altes Testament, 62]).
Günther Hölbl, "Aussagen zur ägyptischen Religion in den Zenonpapyri" in Mario Capasso (ed.), *Papiri Documentari Greci* (Galatina, 1993) 9–36.

———, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches: Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Grossen bis zur römischen Eroberung* (Darmstadt, 1994).
———, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (trans. Tina Saavedra, London, 2001).
C.R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 1, Historians (Chico, 1983).
———, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 3, Aristobulus (Atlanta, 1995).
Maj Sandmann Holmberg, *The God Ptah* (Lund, 1946).
M. Hombert, and C. Préaux, "Les mariages consanguins dans l'Egypte romaine" in *Hommages à J. Bidez et F. Cumont* (Brussels, 1949 [= Collection Latomus, 2]), 135–142
Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: a Study in the Narrative of the* Letter of Aristeas (London and New York, 2003).
K. Hopkins, "Brother-Sister Marriage in Roman Egypt" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 20 (1980), 303–354.
William Horbury and David Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge, 1992).
Wilhelm Hornbostel, *Sarapis. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte, den Erscheinungsformen und Wandlungen der Gestalt eines Gottes* (Leiden, 1973 [= Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire Romain, 32]).
Erik Hornung, *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh: eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen* (Freiburg and Göttingen, 1982 [= Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 46]).
———, "Das 'Offen-Geheime': Begegnung mit Eros im Alten Ägypten" in Detlev Clemens and Tilo Schabert (eds.), *Kulturen des Eros*, (Munich, 2001), 287–320.
Fred W. Householder, Jr. and Donald W. Prakken, "A Ptolemaic Graffito in New York" *TAPA* 76 (1945), 108–116.
Richard Hunter, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge, 1996).
Richard Hunter (ed.), *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley, 2003).
Richard Hunter, "The Argonautica of Apollonius and the Epic Tradition" in Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2004), 89–132.
———, "The Divine and Human Map of the Argonautica" *Syllecta Classica* 6 (1995), 13–27.
———, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge, 1993).
Richard Hunter (ed.), *Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica Book III* (Cambridge, 1989).
Richard Hunter, see also Marco Fantuzzi.
Jamieson B. Hurry, *Imhotep: the Vizier and Physician of King Zoser and afterwards the Egyptian God of Medicine* (second edition, London, 1928).
Werner Huss, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332–30 v. Chr.* (Munich, 2001).
———, *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester: Studien zur Geschichte des ptolemäischen Ägypten* (Stuttgart, 1994).
———, "Ptolemaios der Sohn" *ZPE* 121 (1998), 229–250.
———, "Die in ptolemäischer Zeit verfassten Synodal-Dekrete der ägyptischen Priester" *ZPE* 88 (1991), 189–208.

———, "Die Quellen des Nils" *ChrÉg* 130 (1991), 334–343.
G.O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988).
G.L. Huxley, ΒΟΥΠΟΡΟΣ ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ *JHS* 100 (1980), 189–190.
Jozef Ijsewijn, *De sacerdotibus sacerdotiisque Alexandri Magni et Lagidarum eponymis* (Brussels, 1961 [= Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren. no. 42]).
Tal Ilan, *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Peabody, 1996).
Danielle Inconnu-Bocquillon, *Le mythe de la déesse lointaine à Philae* (Cairo, 2001 [= Bibiliothèque d'Étude, 132]).
David Jacobson, "Marisa Tomb Paintings: Recently Discovered Photos Show Long-Lost Details" *Biblical Archaeological Review* 30.2 (2004), 24–39.
Richard Jasnow, "The Greek Alexander Romance and Demotic Egyptian Literature" *JNES* 56 (1997), 95–103.
———, "'And Pharaoh laughed…' Reflections on Humor in Setne I and Late Period Egyptian Literature" *Enchoria* 27 (2001), 62–81.
Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1968, and repr. Winona Lake, 1993).
Renate Johne, "Women in the Ancient Novel" in Gareth Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden and New York, 1996 [= Bibliotheca Classica Batava supplementum 159]), 151–208.
Elizabeth A. Johnson, *She Who Is: the Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse* (New York, 1992).
Janet H. Johnson (ed.), *The Demotic Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*.http://oi.uchicago.edu/OI/DEPT/PUB/SRC/CDD/CDD.html (8 January 2007).
C.P. Jones, see Christian Habicht.
J.E. Jones, L.H. Sackett and C.W. Eliot, "TO DEMA: a Survey of the Aigaleos-Parnes Wall" *BSA* 52 (1957), 152–189.
Hermann Junker, *Der grosse Pylon des Tempels der Isis in Philä* (Vienna, 1958).
———, *Die Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien nach den Inschriften von Dendera, Edfu und Philae* (Vienna, 1910 [= Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse 54.1]).
P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford, 1959).
Peter Kalkavage (ed.), *Plato's Timaeus: Translation, Glossary, Appendices and Introductory Essay* (Newburyport, 2001).
Jean N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macédoniens: étude linguistique et historique* (2 vols., Athens, 1954 and 1976).
Evangelos Karabélias, "Inceste, mariage et stratégies matrimoniales dans l'Athènes classique" in Thuer Gerhard (ed.), *Symposion 1985. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Ringberg, 24.-26. Juli 1985)* (Cologne, 1989), 233–251, and I. Kukiadis et al. (eds.), *Χαριστήρια στον Ιω. Δεληγιάννη* I (Thessaloniki, 1991), 31–51.
Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis, 1998).
Otto Keller, *Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der griechischen Fabel* (second edition, Leipzig, 1877).

Arnd Kerkhecker, "Mouseon en talaro: Dichter und Dichtung am Ptolemäerhof" *Antike und Abendland* 43 (1997), 124–144.
Otto Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen* (3 vols., Berlin, 1926–1938).
Dieter Kessler, *Die heiligen Tiere und der König. Teil I: Beiträge zu Organisation, Kult und Theologie der spätzeitlichen Tierfriedhöfe* (Wiesbaden, 1989 [= Ägypten und Altes Testament, 16]).
———, "Das hellenistische Serapeum in Alexandria und Ägypten in ägyptologischer Sicht" in Manfred Görg und Günther Hölbl (eds.), *Ägypten und der östliche Mittelmeerraum im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Akten des Interdisziplinären Symposions am Institute für Ägyptologie der Universität München 25.-27.10.1996* (Wiesbaden, 2000 [= Ägypten und Altes Testament, 44]), 163–230.
Zsolt Kiss, "Sarapis de Canope" *Städel-Jahrbuch* n.f. 19 (2004), 387–392.
K.A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (second edition, Warminster, 1986).
Jeffrey Kittay, "Descriptive Limits" *Yale French Studies* 61 (1981), 225–243.
Adolf Klasens, *A Magical Statue Base (Socle Béhague) in the Museum of Antiquities at Leiden* (Leiden, 1952).
Amos Kloner, "Hellenistic Painted Tombs at Maresha" *Michmanim* 14 (2000), 7–16 (Ivrit).
———, *Maresha Excavations Final Report* I: *Subterranean Complexes 21, 44, 70* (Jerusalem, 2003 [= Israel Antiquities Authority Reports, 17]).
Amos Kloner, D. Regev and U. Rappaport 1992. "A Hellenistic Burial Cave in the Judean Shephelah" *'Atiqot* 21 (1992), 27*–50* (Ivrit, English summary pp. 175–177).
E.A. Knauf, "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?" in A. de Pury and T. Römer (eds.), *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (Sheffield, 2000), 388–398.
Michael A. Knibb, see Jennifer M. Dines.
Virginia Knight, *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Leiden, 1995 [= *Mnemosyne* supplement 152]).
J. Kobes, "Mylasa und Kildara in ptolemäischer Hand? Überlegungen zu zwei hellenistischen Inschriften aus Karien" *Etudes Anatoliennes* 24 (1995), 1–6.
Roland Koch, *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe* (Brussels, 1990 [= Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 17]).
Ludwig Koenen, "Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof" in E. van 't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24–26 May 1982* (Louvain, 1983 [= Studia Hellenistica, 27]), 143–190.
———, "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure" in Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A.A. Long and Andrew Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1993 [= Hellenistic Culture and Society, 12]), 25–115.
David Konstan, "Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and Narrative in the Novel" in John R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: the Greek Novel in Context* (London and New York, 1994).
Eleonora Kormysheva, "Arkamani's inscription from Dakke and its historical background" *Warsaw Egyptological Studies I: Essays in honour of Prof. Jadwiga Lipińska* (Warsaw, 1997), 353–361.

Jukka Korpela, *Das Medizinalpersonal im Antiken Rom: eine Sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Helsinki, 1987 [= Annales Academiae scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes humanarum litterarum, 45]).

Heinz Kortenbeutel, *Der ägyptische Süd und Osthandel in der Politik der Ptolemäer und römischen Kaiser* (Diss. Berlin, 1931).

E. Kosmetatou, "The Attalids of Pergamon" in Andrew Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 2003), 159–175.

———, "Bilistiche and the Quasi-Institutional Status of Ptolemaic Royal Mistress" *ArchPF* 50 (2004), 18–36.

———, "Constructing Legitimacy: the Ptolemaic *Familiengruppe* as a Means of Self-Definition in Posidippus' *Hippika*" in Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)* (Cambridge, MA, 2004 [= Hellenic Studies, 2]), 225–246.

———, see also Benjamin Acosta-Hughes.

R.G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (London, 2005).

W. Krebs, "Einige Transportprobleme der antiken Schiffahrt" *Altertum* 11 (1965), 86–101.

Wilhelm Kroll, "Das historische Epos" *Sokrates* 4 (1916) 1–14.

Marc-Antoine Kugener, "Sévère, Patriarche d'Antioche 512–518. Première Partie, vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scholastique" *Patrologia Orientalis* 2.1.6 (Turnhout: 1971).

J. Kügler, "Priestersynoden im hellenistischen Ägypten. Ein Vorschlag zu ihrer sozio-hisroischen Deutung" *Göttinger Miszellen* 139 (1994), 53–60.

Dieter Kurth, "*.ɜśt* (Isis): eine Bezeichnung des Himmels in Texten griech.-röm. Zeit." *Göttinger Miszellen* 19 (1976), 35–36.

Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (London, 1971).

H. Kyrieleis, "Ein hellenistischer Götterkopf" in *Stêlê. Tomos eis mnêmên Nikolaou Kontoleontos* (Athens, 1980), 383–387.

Oscar Landau, *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen* (Göteborg, 1958 [= Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, 7]).

B. Lang, "The 'Writings': a Hellenistic Literary Canon in the Hebrew Bible" in A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn (eds.), *Canonization and Decanonization* (Leiden, 1998 [= Studies in the history of religions, 82]), 41–65.

André Laronde, *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique = Libykai historiai: de l'époque républicaine au principat d'Auguste* (Paris, 1987).

Gerhard Larsson, "Chronology as a Structural Element in the Old Testament" *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 14 (2000), 207–218 http://journalsonline.tandf.co.uk/media/nntr48gohl2utp987d4p/contributions/7/q/l/8/7ql8y7ey9qrr5bpm.pdf (8 November 2006).

M. Launey, "L'exécution de Sotadès et l'expédition de Patroclos dans la mer Egée (266 av. J.-C.)" *RÉA* 47 (1945), 33–45.

———, *Hellenistic Queens* (Baltimore, 1932).

Marcel Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (2 vols., Paris, 1949–1950 [= Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 169]).

———, *Recherches sur les armées Hellénistiques* (réimpression avec addenda et mise à

jour, en postface, par Y. Garlan, P. Gauthier and C. Orrieux, 2 vols., Paris, 1987 [= Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 169]).
Mary R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London, 1981).
———, "Myth and History in the Biography of Apollonius" in Theodore D. Papanghelis and Antonios Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, 2001 [= *Mnemosyne* supplement 217]), 51–71.
———, "The Quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius" *ZPE* 40 (1980), 1–19.
Mary R. Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant (eds.), *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: a Source Book in Translation* (third edition, Baltimore, 2005).
Marie-Thérèse Lenger, "Comment les Ptolémées ont-ils fait la loi dans les territoires non égyptiens de leur obédience?" *Revue internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 6 (1959), 209–225
Pierre Levêque, *Pyrrhos* (Paris, 1957).
Jacob Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen großen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums* (Leipzig, 1867).
———, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim nebst Beiträgen von Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer* (4 vols., Leipzig, 1876–1889).
David M. Lewis, see Russell Meiggs.
Naphtali Lewis, *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1986).
Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* III: *the Late Period* (Berkeley, 1980).
Mario Liverani, "The Libyan Caravan Road in Herodotus IV.181–185" *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 43 (2000), 496–520.
A.B. Lloyd, "The Egyptian Elite in the Early Ptolemaic Period: some Hieroglyphic Evidence" in Daniel Ogden (ed.), *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives* (London and Swansea, 2002), 117–136.
Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin, 1983 [= Texte und Kommentare, 11]).
William Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 2004).
A.A. Long, see Anthony Bulloch.
Gabriella Longega, *Arsinoe II* (Roma, 1968 [= Università degli studi di Padova. Publicazioni dell'Istituto di storia antica, 6).
William T. Loomis, *Wages, Welfare, Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens* (Ann Arbor, 1998).
D. Lorton, "The Supposed Expedition of Ptolemy II to Persia" *JEA* 57 (1971), 160–164.
Erich Lüddeckens, Heinz-Josef Thissen and Wolfgang H.-J. Brunsch (eds.), *Demotisches Namenbuch* (vol. 1 parts 1–3, Wiesbaden, 2000).
Helen S. Lund, *Lysimachus: a Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship* (London and New York, 1992).
John Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1999).
———, "Dans les pas d'Antiochos III: l'Asie Mineure entre pouvoir et discours" in F. Prost (ed.), *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée. Cités et royaumes à l'époque hellénistique*, (Rennes, 2003), 243–259.

———, "Fighting *Poleis* of the Hellenistic World" in Hans van Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* (London and Swansea, 2000), 337–376.
P. Maas, "Glauke 13" *RE* vii (1912), 1896–1897.
———, "Oenanthe's husbands" *JEA* 31 (1946), 74.
Miles Frederick Laming Macadam, *The Temples of Kawa* (vol. 1, London, 1948).
James R. McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps in Attica* (Princeton, 1966 [= *Hesperia* Supplement 11]).
———, see also E. Vanderpool.
Pierre MacKay, see Herman de Meulenaere.
Paul McKechnie, "The Career of Joshua Ben Sira" *JThS* 51.1 (2000), 3–26.
———, *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC* (London and New York, 1989).
Judith S. McKenzie, *The Architecture of Petra* (Oxford, 1990 [= British Academy Monographs in Archaeology, 1]).
———, Sheila Gibson and A.T. Reyes, "Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archaeological Evidence" *JRS* 94 (2004), 73–121.
Judith E. McKinlay, *Gendering Wisdom the Host: Biblical Invitations to Eat and Drink* (Sheffield, 1996 [= Journal for the Study of the Old Testament supplement series, 216]).
R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids, 2003).
Grace Harriet Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens: a Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria and Ptolemaic Egypt* (Baltimore and London, 1932).
Herwig Maehler and Volker Michael Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz, 1978).
J.P. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies* (London, 1895).
Anna Magnetto (ed.), *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci* (vol. 2, Pisa, 1997).
J.G. Manning, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: the Structure of Land Tenure* (Cambridge, 2003).
———, "The Land-Tenure Regime in Ptolemaic Upper Egypt" in Alan K. Bowman and Eugene Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*. (Oxford, 1999 [= Proceedings of the British Academy 96]), 83–102.
Gabriele Marasco, *Sparta agli inizi dell'età ellenistica: il regno di Areo I (309/8–265/4 a.C.)* (Florence, 1980).
Céline Marquaille, *The External Image of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Diss. London, 2001).
Rafael Marrinan, *The Ptolemaic army: its Organisation, Development and Settlement* (Diss. London, 1998).
A.J. Marshall, "The Survival and Development of International Jurisdiction in the Greek World under Roman Rule" *ANRW* 2.13, 626–661.
O. Masson, "Sur le nom de Bilistiché, favorite de Ptolemée II" in *Studia in honorem Iiro Kajanto* (Helsinki, 1985 [= Arctos, acta philologica Fennica, supplementum 2]), 109–112.
Girgis Mattha, *The Demotic Legal Code of Hermopolis West* (Cairo, 1975 [= Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, Bibliothèque d'étude 45]).
S. Mayassis, *Mystères et initiations de l'Egypte ancienne* (Athens, 1957).
P. Mayr, "Serapis—Göttliche Integrationshilfe. Ein neuer Gott als Mittler zwischen zwei Hochkulturen" *Antike Welt* 35.3 (2004), 27–35.

Henry G. Meecham, *The Letter of Aristeas: a Linguistic Study with Special Reference to the Greek Bible* (Manchester, 1935).
Dimitri Meeks, *Le grand texte des donations au temple d'Edfou* (Cairo, 1972 [= Bibliothèque d'Étude de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 59]).
Russell Meiggs and David M. Lewis (eds.), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford, 1969).
N. Meisner, "Aristeasbrief" in W.G. Kuemmel (ed.), *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, II: Unterweisung in erzählender Form, 1: Das Martyrium Jesajas; Aristeasbrief* (Gutersloh, 1973).
Benjamin Dean Meritt, "Athenian Dates by Month and Prytany" *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 255–256.
———, *The Athenian Year* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961).
———, "Mid-Third Century Athenian Archons" *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 78–99.
———, see also W. Kendrick Pritchett.
Reinhold Merkelbach, *Isis regina, Zeus Sarapis: die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Stuttgart, 1995).
———, *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans* (second edition, revised in collaboration with J. Trumpf, Munich, 1977).
I.L. Merker, "The Ptolemaic officials and the League of the Islanders" *Historia* 19 (1970), 141–160.
Lynn Meskell, *Private Life in New Kingdom Egypt* (Princeton, 2002).
Herman De Meulenaere and Pierre MacKay, *Mendes II* (Warminster, 1976).
P.G.P. Meyboom, *The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina: Early Evidence of Egyptian Religion in Italy* (Leiden, 1995).
Russell Middleton, "Brother-Sister and Father-Daughter Marriage in Ancient Egypt" *Americal Sociological Review* 27 (1962), 603–611.
Martina Minas, *Die hieroglyphischen Ahnenreihen der ptolemäischen Könige. Ein Vergleich mit den Titeln der eponymen Priester in den demotischen und griechischen Papyri* (Mainz, 2000 [= Aegyptiaca Treverensia, 9]).
———, "Die Pithom-Stele. Chronologische Bemerkungen zur frühen Ptolemäerzeit" in Martina Minas und Jürgen Zeidler (eds.), *Aspekte spätägyptischer Kultur. Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag* (Mainz am Rhein, 1994 [= Aegyptiaca Treverensia, 7]), 203–212.
Lynette G. Mitchell, *Greeks Bearing Gifts: the Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World 435–323 BC* (Cambridge, 1997).
T.B. Mitford, "Contributions to the Epigraphy of Cyprus" *ArchPF* 13 (1939), 13–38.
———, "Further Contributions to the Epigraphy of Cyprus" *AJA* 65 (1961), 93–151.
———, "The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos" *BSA* 56 (1961), 1–39.
———, *The Inscriptions of Kourion* (Philadelphia, 1971 [= Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 83]).
Joseph Modrzejewski, "Le droit hellénistique et la famille grecque" in Claude Bontems (ed.), *Nonagesimo anno. Mélanges en hommage à Jean Gaudemet* (Paris, 1999), 261–280.
———, "Entre la cité et le fisc: le statut grec dans l'Egypte romaine" in Fran-

cisco Javier Fernández Nieto (ed.), *Symposion 1982. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Santander, 1.-4. September 1982)* (Cologne, 1989), 241–280.

———, "Die Geschwisterehe in der hellenistischen Praxis und nach römischem Recht" *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Romanistische Abteilung* 81 (1964), 52–82, reprinted with additional material in Joseph Modrzejewski (ed.), *Status personnel et liens de famille dans les droits de l'Antiquité* (Aldershot, 1993).

———, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Princeton, 1995).

———, "Paroles néfastes et 'vers obscènes'. A propos de l'injure verbale en droit grec et hellénistique", in Jacqueline Hoareau-Dodinau, Xavier Rousseaux and Pascal Texier (eds.), *Le pardon* (Limoges, 1999 [= Cahiers de l'Institut d'anthropologie juridique, 3]), 569–585.

Mohamed Gamal el-Din Mokhtar, *Ihnâsya el-Medina (Herakleopolis Magna): its Importance and its Role in Pharaonic History* (Cairo, 1983 [= Bibliothèque d'étude, 40]).

Arnaldo Momigliano, "A New Date for the Battle of Andros? A Discussion" *CQ* 44 (1950), 107–118.

———, "Genesi storica e funzione attuale del concetto di ellenismo", (1935) *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome 1955) 165–193.

———, "J.G. Droysen between Greeks and Jews" (1970), *Quinto Contributo* (Rome 1975) 109–126.

Pierre Montet, *Géographie de l'Égypte ancienne* (Paris, 1957).

Johannes C. de Moor, "The duality in God and Man: Gen 1:26–27" in Johannes C. de Moor (ed.), *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel: Papers read at the tenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en Belgie, held at Oxford, 1977* (Leiden, 1998 [= Oudtestamentische studiën, 40]), 112–125.

David Chioni Moore, see Martin Bernal.

L. Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography* (Brussels, 1975 [= Verhandelingen van de Kononklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schoone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 78]).

———, "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy" in E. van 't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24–26 May 1982* (Louvain, 1983 [= Studia Hellenistica, 27]), 205–240.

L. Mooren (ed.), *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro 19–24 July 1997* (Leuven, 2000 [= Studia Hellenistica, 36]).

Luigi Moretti, *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici* (Rome, 1957 [= Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Ser. 8, v. 8]).

———, "Epigraphica" *RivFil* 93 (1965), 173–185.

Anatole Mori, "Personal Favor and Public Influence: Arete, Arsinoë II, and the Argonautica" *Oral Tradition* 16.1 (2001), 85–106.

M.J. Moscovich, "Hostage Regulations in the Treaty of Zama" *Historia* 23:4 (1974), 417–427.

J.M. Mossman, "Plutarch, Pyrrhus, and Alexander" in Philip A. Stadter (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London and New York, 1992), 90–104.
Glenn W. Most, "Classical Scholarship and Literary Criticism" in H.B. Nisbet and C. Rawson (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism IV The Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1997), 742–757.
W.J. Moulton, "An Inscribed Tomb at Beit Jibrin" *AJA* 19 (1915), 63–70.
K. Mras, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Eusebius Werke*, vol. 8 part 2, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica* (Berlin, 1956).
Brian P. Muhs, *Taxes, Taxpayers and Tax Receipts in Early Ptolemaic Thebes* (Chicago, 2005 [= University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, 126]).
C.W. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Paris, 1841–1851).
Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: a Plea for the Septuagint* (Sheffield, 1996).
O. Munnich, see G. Dorival.
Maria Münster, *Untersuchungen zur Göttin Isis vom Alten Reich bis zum Ende des Neuen Reiches* (Berlin, 1968 [= Münchner Ägyptologische Studien, 11]).
Oswyn Murray, "Aristeas and his Sources" in E. Livingstone, *Papers presented to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1971* (Berlin, 1975 [= Studia Patristica, 12]), 123–128.
———, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship" *Journal of Theological Studies* 18 (1967), 337–371.
———, "Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture", *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1972), 200–213.
———, "The Letter of Aristeas", in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici* II (Pisa, 1987) 15–29.
———, "Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World" in T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J.K. Aitken, J. Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (forthcoming).
W.M. Murray, "Observations on the '*Isis* Scraffito' at Nymphaion" in Harry Tzalas, *Tropis VII: Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Ship Construction in Antiquity, Pylos, 1999* (2 vols., Athens, 2002), 539–561.
W. Muss-Arnolt, "Semitic Words in Greek and Latin" *TAPA* 23 (1892), 35–156.
G. Mussies, "Some Notes on the Name of Sarapis" in Margreet B. de Boer and T.A. Edridge (eds.), *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren: recueil d'études offert par les auteurs de la série 'Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain' à Maarten J. Vermaseren à l'occasion de son soixantème anniversaire le 7 avril* (Leiden, 1978 [= Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 68]), 821–832.
Edouard Naville, "La stèle de Pithom" *ZÄS* 40 (1902–1903), 66–75.
———, *The Store-City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus* (fourth edition, London, 1903).
Leslie H. Neatby, "Romano-Egyptian Relations during the Third Century BC" *TAPA* 81 (1950), 89–98.
Giuseppe Nenci, *Pirro: Aspirazioni egemoniche ed equilibrio mediterraneo* (Turin, 1953).
Paul Nicholson, see Ian Shaw.
George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity and Transformation* (Minneapolis, 2003).

Ino Nicolaou, *Cypriot Inscribed Stones* (Nicosia, 1971).
Frank Nisetich (trans.), *The Poems of Callimachus* (Oxford, 2001).
S. Noorda, "Illness and Sin, Forgiving and Healing: the Connection of Medical Treatment and Religious Beliefs in Ben Sira 38, 1–15" in M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden, 1979 [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire Romain, 78]), 215–224.
E. Noort, "The creation of man and woman in biblical and ancient near eastern traditions" in Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (Leiden, 2000 [= Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions, 1]), 1–18.
M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, Erster Teil: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (second edition, Tübingen, 1957).
David Noy, see William Horbury.
J.F. Nunn, *Ancient Egyptian Medicine* (London, 1996).
John F. Oates et al (eds.), *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets* (fifth edition, Oakville, 2001 [= BASP Supplement 9]).
John F. Oates, *The Ptolemaic Basilikos Grammateus* (Atlanta, 1995 [= BASP Supplement 8]).
Daniel Ogden (ed.), *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives* (London, 2002).
Daniel Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: the Hellenistic Dynasties* (London, 1999).
R.M. Ogilvie, see F.W. Walbank.
Graham J. Oliver, "Regions and Micro-Regions: Grain for Rhamnous" in Zofia H. Archibald et al. (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies* (London and New York, 2001), 137–155.
James L. O'Neil, "The Creation of New Dynasties after the Death of Alexander the Great" *Prudentia* 32.2 (2000), 118–137.
———, "The Ethnic Origins of the Friends of the Antigonid Kings of Macedon" *CQ* 53 (2003), 510–522.
Vladimir E. Orel and Olga V. Stolbova, *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Materials for a Reconstruction* (Leiden, 1995 [= Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abteilung 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, 18]).
E. Oren and U. Rappaport, "The Necropolis of Maresha—Beit Govrin" *IEJ* 34 (1984), 114–153.
H.M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators" *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975), 89–114.
Wolfgang Orth, "Ptolemaios II. und die Septuaginta-Übersetzung" in Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutiung der Griechischen Bibel* (Stuttgart, 2001 [= Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 8. Folge, Heft 13 = der ganzen Sammlung Heft 153]) 97–114.
Michael J. Osborne, "The Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century BC" *ZPE* 78 (1989) 209–242.
———, *Naturalization in Athens* (4 vols., Brussels, 1981–1983 Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone

Kunsten van Belgie, Klasse der Letteren: jaarg. 43, nr. 98, jaarg. 44, nr. 101, jaarg. 45, nr. 109).
Eberhard Otto, *Das Ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual* (Wiesbaden, 1960 [= Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, 3]).
———, *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit; ihre geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung* (Leiden, 1954 [= Probleme der Ägyptologie, 2]).
Theodore D. Papanghelis and Antonios Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, 2001 [= Mnemosyne supplement 217]).
W. Pape and G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Brunswick, 1911).
H.W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers from Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus* (Oxford, 1933).
Holt T. Parker, "Women Doctors in Greece, Rome, and the Byzantine Empire" in Lillian R. Furst (ed.), *Women Healers and Physicians: Climbing the Long Hill* (Lexington, 1997), 131–150.
Anna Passoni Dell'Acqua, "I LXX nella biblioteca di Alessandria" *Adamantius* 8 (2002), 114–126.
P. Pédech, *La géographie des Grecs* (Paris, 1976).
———, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris, 1964).
Jaroslav Pelikan, *What has Athens to Do with Jerusalem? Timaeus and Genesis in Counterpoint* (Ann Arbor, 1997 [= Jerome Lectures, 21]).
André Pelletier (ed.), *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (Paris, 1962 [= Sources chrétiennes, 89]).
W. Peremans and E. van 't Dack (eds.), *Prospographia Ptolemaica* (9 vols., Louvain, 1950–1981).
M.C. Pérez Die, "Excavaciones en Ehnasya el Medina (Heracleópolis Magna). La aportación española" in Alfonso Martín Flores and María Victoria López Hervás (eds.), *Españoles en el Nilo*, I. *Misiones arqueológicas en Egipto* (Madrid, 2004), 63–88.
P.W. Pestman, "The Family Archive which Changes History" in S.P. Vleeming (ed.), *Hundred-gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Leiden, 1995 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 27]), 91–100.
P.W. Pestman (ed.), *Greek and Demotic Texts from the Zenon Archive* (Leiden, 1980 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 20]).
P.W. Pestman (ed.), *A Guide to the Zenon Archive* (Leiden, 1981 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 21]).
P.W. Pestman, *Marriage and Matrimonial Property in Ancient Egypt: a Contribution to Establishing the Legal Position of the Woman* (Leiden, 1961 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 9]).
J.P. Peters and H. Thiersch, *Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa* (London, 1905).
B.C. Petrakos, *Epigraphika tou Oropou* (Athens, 1980).
Carsten Peust, *Das Napatanische: ein ägyptischer Dialekt aus dem Nubien des späten ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausends; Texte, Glossar, Grammatik* (Göttingen, 1999 [= Monographien zur ägyptischen Sprache, 3]).
R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus, vol.* I: *Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1949).
Stefan Pfeiffer, *Das Dekret von Kanopos (238 v. Chr.): Kommentar und historische*

Auswertung eines dreisprachigen Synodaldekeretes der ägyptischen Priester zu Ehren Ptolemaios' III. *und seiner Familie* (Munich, 2004 [= Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft 18]).

———, "Die Entsprechung ägyptischer Götter im griechischen Pantheon. Bemerkungen zur Überwindung interkultureller Differenz am Fallbeispiel der Inschrift des Herodes im Liebieghaus Frankfurt (LH Inv. 1628 = *OGIS* I 130) und verwandter Texte" in H. Beck, P.C. Bol and M. Bückling (eds.), *Ägypten Griechenland Rom. Abwehr und Berührung* (Tübingen and Berlin, 2005), 285–290.

C. Picard, "Sur la patrie et pérégrinations de Demeter".*RÉG* 40 (1927), 330–369.

Luigi Piccirilli (ed.), *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci* (vol. 1, Pisa, 1973).

Christian Pietsch, *Die Argonautika des Apollonios von Rhodos: Untersuchungen zum Problem der einheitlichen Konzeption des Inhalts* (Stuttgart, 1999 [= *Hermes* Einzelschriften, 80]).

Linda J. Piper, *Spartan Twilight* (New Rochelle, 1986).

Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (2 vols., Berne and Munich, 1959 and 1969).

Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York, 1975).

———, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt* (New York, 1984).

J. Pouilloux, "Glaucon, fils d'Etéoclès, d'Athènes" in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergael (eds.), *Le monde grec: pensée, littérature, histoire, documents. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 376–382.

Donald W. Prakken, see Fred W. Householder, Jr.

Claire Préaux, *Le Monde hellénistique, fourth edition, vol. 1: La Grèce et l'Orient, 323–146 av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1997).

———, "Sur les communications de l'Ethiopie avec l'Egypte hellénistique" *ChrÉg* 27 (1952), 257–281.

Karl Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung* (Leipzig, 1933).

Gerald A. Press, "Plato" in Richard H. Popkin (ed.), *The Columbia History of Philosophy* (New York, 1999) 32–52.

Roberto Pretagostini, *Ricerche sulla poesia alessandrina: Teocrito, Callimaco, Sotade* (Rome, 1984).

S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984).

James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, 1950).

W. Kendrick Pritchett and Benjamin Dean Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, MA, 1940).

W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* (vols. 1–5, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971–1991).

A. de Pury, "Qohéleth et le canon des Ketubim" *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 131 (1999), 163–198.

Joachim Friedrich Quack, "Beiträge zum Peripherdemotischen" in T.A. Bács (ed.), *A Tribute to Excellence: Studies Offered in Honour of Ernö Gaál, Ulrich Luft, László Török* (Budapest, 2002 [= Studia Aegyptiaca 17]), 393–403.

Joachim F. Quack, *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte* 3: *die demotische und gräko-ägyptische Literatur* (Münster, 2005 [= Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 3]).

———, "Ich bin Isis, Herrin der beiden Länder" in Sibylle Meyer (ed.), *Egypt: Temple of the Whole World/Ägypten: Tempel der Gesamten Welt, Studies in Honour of Jan Assmann*. (Leiden, 2003 [= Studies in the History of Religions, 97]), 319–365.

Joachim F. Quack and Kim Ryholt, *A Miscellany of Demotic Texts and Studies* (Copenhagen, 2000 [= Carlsberg Papyri, 3]).

Joachim F. Quack, "Ein neuer prophetischer Text aus Tebtynis (Papyrus Carlsberg 399 + Papyrus PSI Inv. D. 17 + Papyrus Tebtunis Tait 13 vs)" in Andreas Blasius and Bernd U. Schipper (eds.), *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (Leuven, 2002 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 107]), 253–274.

———, "Der pränatale Geschlechtsverkehr von Isis und Osiris sowie eine Notiz zum Alter des Osiris" *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 32 (2004), 327–332.

———, review of Friedhelm Hoffmann and Heinz J. Thissen (eds.), *Res Severa Verum Gaudium: Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juni 2004* (Leuven, 2004 [Studia Demotica, 6]): *ArchPF* 51.1 (2005), 179–186.

———, "Serapis" in Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike* (vol. 11, Stuttgart, 1996–2003).

Jan Quaegebeur, "Cleopatra VII and the Cults of the Ptolemaic Queens" in R.S. Bianchi et al. (eds.), *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies* (New York, 1988), 41–54.

———, "Documents concerning the Cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos at Memphis" *JNES* 30 (1971), 239–270.

———, "Documents égyptiens anciens et nouveaux relatifs à Arsinoé Philadelphe" in Henri Melaerts (ed.*), Le culte du souverain dans L'Égypte Ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère: actes du colloque international, Bruxelles 10 mai 1995* (Louvain, 1998), 73–108.

———, "Ptolémée II en adoration devant Arsinoé II divinisée" *BIFAO* 69 (1971), 191–217.

———, "Reines ptolémaïques et traditions égyptiennes" in H. Maehler and V.M. Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz, 1978), 245–262.

C. Ravazzolo, "Tolomeo figlio di Tolomeo II filadelfo" *Studi ellenistici* 8 (1996), 123–143.

J.D. Ray, *The Archive of Hor* (Oxford, 1976).

B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1989).

Donald B. Redford, *From Slave to Pharaoh: the Black Experience of Ancient Egypt* (Baltimore, 2004).

———, *The Wars in Syria and Palestine of Thutmose* III (Leiden and Boston, 2003 [= Culture and history of the ancient Near East, 16]).

Carol A. Redmount, "The Wadi Tumilat and the 'Canal of the Pharaohs'" *JNES* 54 (1995), 127–135.

Gary Reger, "The Date of the Battle of Kos" *AJAH* 10 (1985 [published 1993]), 155–177.
———, "The Political History of the Kyklades, 260–200 BC" *Historia* 43 (1994), 32–69.
D. Regev, "The Transitional Phase between the Persian and Hellenistic Periods at Marissa" in S. Drougou (ed.) *The Third Scholarly Conference on Hellenistic Pottery, Thessalonika, September 1991*, (Athens, 1994), 272–274.
A.T. Reyes, see Judith S. McKenzie.
P.J. Rhodes, *A History of the Classical Greek World 478–323 BC* (Malden and Oxford, 2006).
Ellen E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford, 1983).
Robert K. Ritner, "Horus on the Crocodiles: a Juncture of Religion and Magic" in James P. Allen et al (eds.), *Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Egypt* (New Haven, 1989 [= Yale Egyptological Studies, 3]), 103–116.
———, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice* (Chicago, 1993 [= Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 54]).
———, "Medicine" in D.B. Redford (ed.), *Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* (vol. 2, Oxford, 2001), 353–356.
Ritner, Robert (trans.), "The Romance of Setna Khaemuas and the Mummies (Setna I)" in William Kelly Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelea, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 453–469.
———, "The Adventures of Setna and Si-Osire (Setna II)" in William Kelly Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 470–489.
———, "The Childhood of Si-Osire (Jug Strassburg)" in William Kelly Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 490–491.
Jeanne and Louis Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie, I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions* (Paris, 1983).
Louis Robert, *Etudes épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris, 1938).
———, "Un décret d'Ilion et un papyrus concernant des cultes royaux" in A.E. Samuel (ed.), *Essays in honor of C. Bradford Welles* (New Haven, 1966), 175–211.
C.H. Roberts, see P.M. Fraser.
Noel Robertson, "The Decree of Themistocles in its Contemporary Setting" *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 1–44.
Gay Robins, "The God's Wife of Amun in the 18th Dynasty in Egypt" in Averil Cameron and Amélie Kuhrt (eds.), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (revised edition, London, 1993), 65–78
———, "The Relationships specified by Egyptian Kinship Terms of the Middle and New Kingdoms" *ChrÉg* 54 (1979), 197–217
Günther Roeder, *Die Ägyptische Götterwelt* (Zurich, 1959).
Eugene Rogan, see Alan K. Bowman.
Israel Roll, "Classicisme et provincialisme dans l'Orient classique méditerranéen à l'époque hellénistique et romaine" in *Πρακτικά του XII διεθνούς συνεδρίου κλασικής ἀρχαιολογίας, Ἀθήνα, 4–10 Σεπτεμβρίου, 1983* (vol. 1, Athens, 1985).

T.C. Römer, "Competing Magicians in Exodus 7–9: Interpreting Magic in the Priestly Theology" in Todd E. Klutz (ed.), *Magic in the Biblical World: from the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon* (London, 2003 [= *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* supplement series, 245]), 12–22.

H.N. Rösel, "Does a Comprehensive Leitmotiv Exist in the Deuteronomistic History?" in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leuven, 2000), 195–212.

Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (Berlin, 1994 [= Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 223]).

Mikhail Ivanovich Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (London, 1941).

M. Rostowzew, "Πυθόλαος" *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 5 (1913), 181.

Joanna Rostropowicz, *Odbicie rzeczywistości politycznej, społecznej i gospodarczej w poezji aleksandryjskiej* (Warsaw, 1983).

Anne Roullet, *The Egyptian and Egyptianizing Monuments of Imperial Rome* (Leiden, 1972 [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain, 20]).

G. Roux, "Structure and Style of the Rotunda of Arsinoe" in Karl Lehmann and Phyllis Williams Lehmann (eds.), *The Rotunda of Arsinoe* (2 vols., Princeton, 1992 [= Bollingen Series, 60; Samothrace, 7]), 92–230.

Jane Rowlandson (ed.), *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt* (Cambridge, 1998).

Winfried J.R. Rübsam, *Götter und Kulte in Faijum während der griechisch-römisch-byzantinischen Zeit* (Bonn, 1974).

David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato* (Leiden, 1986 [= Philosophia antiqua, 44]).

———, *Philo of Alexandria: On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Leiden, 2001 [= Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series, 1]).

K.T. Rydstrom, "HRY SŠT3 'in Charge of Secrets': the 3000-year Evolution of a Title" *Discussions in Egyptology* 28 (1994), 53–94.

Kim Ryholt, "On the Contents and Nature of the Tebtunis Temple Library: a Status Report" in Sandra Lippert and Maren Schentuleit (eds.), *Tebtynis und Soknopaiu Nesos: Leben im römerzeitlichen Fajum: Akten des Internationalen Symposions vom 11. bis 13. Dezember 2003 in Sommerhausen bei Würzburg* (Wiesbaden, 2005), 141–170.

———, "Nectanebo's Dream or the Prophecy of Petesis" in Andreas Blasius and Bernd U. Schipper (eds.), *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (Leuven, 2002 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 107]), 221–242.

———, see also Joachim F. Quack.

L.H. Sackett, see J.E. Jones.

Erja Salmenkivi, "Der Wert des archäologischen Kontextes für die Deutung der Urkunden—die Berliner Kartonage" in Bärbel Kramer (ed.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997 [= *ArchPF* Beiheft 3 Band 2]), 1083–1087.

———, *Cartonnage Papyri in Context: New Ptolemaic Documents from Abu Sir al-Malaq*. (Helsinki, 2002 [= Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 119]).
C. Sambin, "Médamoud et les dieux de Djéme sous les premiers Ptolémées" in S.P. Vleeming (ed.), *Hundred-gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Leiden, 1995 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 27]), 163–168.
C. Sambin and J.-F. Carlotti, "Une porte de fête-sed de Ptolémée II remployée dans le temple de Montou à Médamoud" *BIFAO* 95 (1995), 383–457.
Alan E. Samuel, "The Internal Organization of the Nomarch's Bureau in the Third Century BC" in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (New Haven, 1966 [= American Studies in Papyrology]), 213–229.
———, "The Ptolemies and the Ideology of Kingship". Peter Green (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture* (Berkeley, 1993), 168–192.
———, *The Shifting Sands of History: Interpretations of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Lanham and London, 1989 [= Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians 2]).
Jack T. Sanders, *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (Chico, 1983 [= Society for Biblical Literature monograph series, 28]).
Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique* (Geneva, 1998 [= Hautes études du monde gréco-romain, 25]).
Hans-Joachim Schalles, *Untersuchungen zur Kulturpolitik der pergamenischen Herrscher im dritten Jarhundert v. Chr.* (Tübingen, 1985 [= Istanbuler Forschungen, 36]).
D.M. Schaps, "The Women of Greece in Wartime" *CPh* 77 (1982), 193–213.
Tanja S. Scheer, *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild: Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik* (Munich, 2000 [= Zetemata, 105]).
Bernd Ulrich Schipper, *Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit: die kulturellen Kontakte von Salomo bis zum Fall Jerusalems* (Freiburg and Göttingen, 1999).
Gareth Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden and New York, 1996 [= Bibliotheca Classica Batava supplementum 159]).
K. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus* (Neukirchen, 1999).
Stefan Schmidt, "Serapis—ein neuer Gott für die Griechen in Ägypten" in H. Beck, P.C. Bol and M. Bückling (eds.), *Ägypten Griechenland Rom. Abwehr und Berührung* (Tübingen and Berlin, 2005), 291–304.
Armin Schmitt, "Interpretation der Genesis aus hellenistischem Geist" *ZATW* 86 (1974), 137–163.
Hatto H. Schmitt, "Geschwisterehe" in Hatto H. Schmitt and Ernst Vogt (eds.), *Kleines Lexikon des Hellenismus* (Wiesbaden, 1993), 373.
K. Schneider, "Hetairai" *RE* viii (1913), 1331–1372.
Siegfried Schott, *Urkunden mythologischen Inhalts* (Leipzig, 1939).
Silvia Schroer, *Wisdom has Built her House: Studies on the Figure of Sophia in the Bible* (Collegeville, 2000).
Regine Schulz, "Warum Isis? Gedanken zum universellen Charakter einer ägyptischen Göttin im Römischen Reich" in Manfred Görg und Günther Hölbl (eds.), *Ägypten und der östliche Mittelmeerraum im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.: Akten des interdisziplinären Symposions am Institut für Ägyptologie der Universität München 25.-27.10.1996* (Wiesbaden, 2000 [= Ägypten und Altes Testament, 44]), 251–280.

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: a Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (second edition, New York, 1992).
H.H. Scullard, *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World* (Ithaca, 1974).
J. Seibert, "Ptolemaios I. und Milet" Chiron 1 (1971), 159–166.
———, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemaios*' I (Munich, 1969).
Peter Seibert, *Die Characteristik: Untersuchungen zu einer altägyptischen Sprechsitte und ihren Ausprägungen in Folklore und Literatur* (Wiesbaden, 1967 [= Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, 17]).
Florian Seiler, *Die Griechische Tholos. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung, Typologie und Funktion kunstmässiger Rundbauten* (Mainz am Rhein, 1986).
Nick Sekunda, *Seleucid and Ptolemaic Reformed Armies, 168–145 BC, vol. 2: the Ptolemaic army under Ptolemy VI Philometor* (Stockport, 1995).
Kurt Sethe, *Dramatische Texte zu altaegyptischen Mysterienspielen* (Leipzig, 1928 [= Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens, 10]).
———, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit* 3 vols., (Leipzig, 1904–1916).
Klaus Seybold and Ulrich B. Mueller, *Sickness and Healing* (Nashville, 1978).
Byron E. Shafer (ed.), *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice* (Ithaca, 1991).
Brent D. Shaw, "Explaining Incest: Brother-Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt" *Man* n.s. 27. (1992), 267–299.
Ian Shaw and Paul Nicholson (eds.), *British Museum Dictionary of Ancient Egypt* (London, 1995).
Ian Shaw (ed.), *Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford, 2000).
Theodore Leslie Shear, Jr., *Kallias of Sphettos and the revolt of Athens in 286 BC* (Princeton, 1978 [= *Hesperia* supplement 17]).
Graham Shipley, *The Greek World after Alexander, 323–30 BC* (London, 2000).
———, *A History of Samos, 800–188 BC* (Oxford, 1987).
Victor Shklovskii, *Theory of Prose* (Elmwood Park, 1990).
Steven E. Sidebotham and Willemina Wendrich (eds.), *Berenike 94–98: Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Berenike (Egyptian Red Sea Coast) and the Survey of the Eastern Desert* (5 vols., Leiden, 1995–2000).
Steven E. Sidebotham and Ronald E. Zitterkopf, "Routes Through the Eastern Desert of Egypt" *Expedition* 37 (1995), 39–52.
Folker Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münster, 2001 [= Münsteraner Judaistische Studien, 9]).
D.P. Silverman, "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt" in Byron E. Shafer (ed.), *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice* (Ithaca, 1991), 7–87.
R.S. Simpson, *Demotic Grammar in the Ptolemaic Sacerdotal Decrees* (Oxford, 1996).
William Kelly Simpson, trans., "King Cheops and the Magicians," in William Kelly Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories. Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003),13–24.
William K. Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003).
N. Sjöberg, see E. Andersson.

T.C. Skeat, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum (now in the British Library) vol. 7: the Zenon Archive* (London, 1974).
Harry S. Smith, "The Death and Life of the Mother of Apis" in Alan B. Lloyd (ed.), *Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Gwyn Griffiths*, (London, 1992 [= Egypt Exploration Society Occasional Publications, 8]), 201–225.
Harry S. Smith and William J. Tait (eds.), *Saqqâra Demotic Papyri* I (London, 1983 [= Egypt Exploration Society Texts from Excavations, 7]).
Mark Smith, see Mark Depauw.
John G. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach* (Cambridge,1974).
A. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece: an Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries BC* (Edinburgh, 1971).
Raija Sollamo, "The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the LXX", in Bernard A. Taylor, *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Oslo 1998* (Atlanta, 2001), 329–342.
Joshua D. Sosin, "P.Duk.inv. 677: Aetos, from Arsinoite Strategos to Eponymous Priest" *ZPE* 116 (1997), 141–146.
Antony Spawforth, see Paul Cartledge.
Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Der ägyptische Mythus vom Sonnenauge: nach dem Leidener demotischen Papyrus I. 384* (Strassburg, 1917).
———, *Die demotischen Denkmäler 2. Die demotischen Papyrus* (Strassburg, 1906).
———, *Demotische Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1925).
———, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des pap. 215 der Bibliothèque nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten* (Leipzig, 1914 [= Demotische Studien 7]).
Martin Stadler, "'Das Kind sprach zu ihr' Ein Dialog der Isis mit einem göttlichen Kind im Papyrus Wien D. 12006" in Dagmar Budde, Sandra Sandri und Ursula Verhoeven (eds.), *Kindgötter im Ägypten der griechisch-römischen Zeit: Zeugnisse aus Stadt und Tempel als Spiegel des interkulturellen Kontakts* (Leuven, 2003 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 128]) 301–322.
J.E. Stambaugh, *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies* (Leiden, 1972 [= Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 25]).
A. Steinberg, see E. Vanderpool.
Henricus Stephanus, *Thesauros tes Ellenikes glosses = Thesaurus Graecae linguae* (8 vols in 9 [vols. 2–8 edited by Hase with Wilhelm and Ludwig Dindorf], Paris, 1831–1865).
Susan A. Stephens, "For you Arsinoe" in Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)* (Cambridge, MA, 2004 [= Hellenic Studies, 2]), 161–176.
Susan A. Stephens and John J. Winkler (eds.), *Ancient Greek Novels: the Fragments* (Princeton, 1995).
Susan A. Stephens, *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley, 2003).
Gregory E. Sterling, "Judaism between Jerusalem and Alexandria" in John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame, 2001 [= Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series, 13]), 265–301.

Heike Sternberg, *Mythische Motive und Mythenbildung in den Ägyptischen Tempeln und Papyri der griechisch-römischen Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1985 [= Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe, Ägypten 14]).
H. von Steuben, see W. Ameling.
A. Stewart, see Anthony Bulloch.
Olga V. Stolbova, see Vladimir E. Orel.
B.J. Stratton, *Out of Eden: Rhetoric and Ideology in Genesis 2–3* (Sheffield, 1995 [= *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* supplement 208]).
B. Strauss, "Perspectives on the Death of Fifth Century Athenian Seamen" in Hans van Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* (London and Swansea, 2000), 261–283
Volker Michael Strocka, see Herwig Maehler.
R.S. Stroud, "An Ancient Fort on Mount Oneion" *Hesperia* 40 (1971), 127–145.
———, "Greek Inscriptions: Theozotides and the Athenian Orphans" *Hesperia* 40 (1971), 280–301.
Claudia Suhr, "Zum fiktiven Erzähler in der ägyptischen Literatur" in Gerald Moers (ed.), *Definitely, Egyptian Literature: proceedings of the symposion 'Ancient Egyptian literature: history and forms', Los Angeles, March 24–26, 1995* (Göttingen, 1999 [= *Lingua Aegyptia* Studia Monographica, 2]), 91–129.
A.C. Sundberg, Jr., *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1964).
A. Swiderek, "Sarapis et les Hellénomemphites" in Jean Bingen, Guy Cambier, Georges Nachtergael (eds.), *Le monde grec. Pensée, littérature, histoire, documents. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 670–675.
O. Szemerényi, "Latin *promulgare*" *Emerita* 22 (1954), 159–174.
William J. Tait, "P. Carslberg 207: Two columns of a Setna-text" in Paul J. Frandsen (ed.), *Demotic Texts from the Collection* (Copenhagen, 1991 [= Carlsberg Papyri, 1]), 19–46.
———, "Egyptian Fiction in Demotic and Greek" in J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: the Greek Novel in Context* (London, 1994), 203–222.
Gábor Takács, *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian* (Leiden, 2001 [= Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung, Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, 48]).
R.J.A. Talbert, "The Greeks in Sicily and South Italy" in Lawrence A Tritle (ed.), *The Greek world in the Fourth Century: from the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander*. (London and New York, 1996), 137–166.
W.W. Tarn, "Nauarch and Nesiarch" *JHS* 31 (1911), 251–259.
———, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford, 1913).
———, "The Arcadian League and Aristodemos" *CR* 39 (1925), 104–107.
W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilisation* (third edition, London, 1952).
Argyro B. Tataki, *Macedonians abroad: a Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia* (Athens, 1998).
A.E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (Oxford, 1928).
Victor A. Tcherikover, "The Third Book of Maccabees as Historical Source of Augustus' Time" in Alexander Fuks and Israel Halpern, *Scripta Hierosolymitana VII: Historical Studies* (Jerusalem, 1961), 1–26.

J.H. Thiel, *A History of Roman Sea-power before the Second Punic War* (Amsterdam, 1954).
Gaëtan Thiérault, *Le culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques* (Lyon, 1996).
H. Thierfelder, *Die Geschwisterehe im hellenistisch-römischen Aegypten* (Münster, 1960).
Christophe Thiers, "Un naos de Ptolémée II Philadelphe consacré à Sokar" *BIFAO* 97 (1997), 253–268.
———, "Ptolémée Philadelphe et les prêtres de Saïs. La stèle Codex Ursinianus, fol. 6 ro. + Naples 1034 + Louvre C.123" *BIFAO* 99 (1999), 423–445.
———, "De Saïs aux Jardins de Salluste. A propos d'un document reconsidéré" in Sydney H. Aufrère (ed.), *La vallée du Nil et la Méditerranée: voies de communication et vecteurs culturels: Actes du colloque des 5 et 6 juin 1998, université Paul Valéry, Montpellier* (Montpellier, 2001 [= Orientalia Monspeliensia, 12]), 151–166.
———, "La stèle de Pithom et les douanes de Philadelphe (*Pithom*, 1.10)" *Göttinger Miszellen* 157 (1997), 95–101.
———, 'Le mariage divin des dieux Adelphes dans la stèle de mendès (CCiare CG 22183) *ZÄS* 134 (2007), 68–69.
———, Ptolémée philadelphe et les prêtres d'Atoum de Tjékou: Nouvelle édition commentée de la "stèle de Pitnom" (CGC 22183) (Montpellier, 2007).
J.D. Thomas, "Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: the Dioiketes and the Nomarch" in Herwig Maehler and Volker Michael Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz, 1978), 187–194.
Dorothy Burr Thompson, "Glauke and the Goose" in Lucy Freeman Sandler (ed.), *Essays in memory of Karl Lehmann* (New York, 1964 [= *Marsyas* supplement 1]), 314–322.
———, *Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience: Aspects of the Ruler Cult* (Oxford, 1973).
Dorothy J. Thompson, "*Ethnê*, taxes and administrative geography in early Ptolemaic Egypt" in Isabella Andorlini et al (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998* (Florence, 2001), 1255–1263.
———, "The Exceptionality of the Early Ptolemaic Fayyum" in Mario Capasso and P. Davoli (eds), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum* (Lecce, 2005 = Papyrologica Lupiensia, 14]), 303–310.
———, "Irrigation and Drainage in the Early Ptolemaic Fayyum" in Alan K. Bowman and Eugene Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*. (Oxford, 1999 [= Proceedings of the British Academy 96]), 107–122.
———, "Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt" in Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf, *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1994), 67–83.
———, *Memphis under the Ptolemies* (Princeton, 1988).
———, "Philadelphus' Procession: Dynastic Power in a Mediterranean Context" in Leon Mooren (ed.), *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro 19–24 July 1997* (Leuven, 2000 [Studia Hellenistica, 36]) 365–388.

———, "Ptolemaios and the 'Lighthouse': Greek Culture in the Memphite Serapeum" *PCPS* 33 (1987), 105–121.
———, see also Willy Clarysse.
———, see also Dorothy J. Crawford.
Herbert Thompson, see Francis Llewellyn Griffith.
T.L. Thompson, "An Introduction: Can a History of Ancient Jerusalem and Palestine be Written?" in T.L. Thompson (ed.), *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition* (London, 2003), 1–15.
Rudolf Thurneysen, *A Grammar of Old Irish* (trans. D.A. Binchy and Osborn Bergin, Dublin, 1946).
B. Tkaczow, "Remarques sur la topographie et l'architecture de l'ancienne Alexandrie dans les textes antiques" *Archeologia* 35 (1984), 1–25.
M.N. Tod, "A Bilingual Dedication from Alexandria" *JEA* 28 (1942), 53–58.
M.N. Tod (ed.), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1948).
J. Tondriau, "Princesses ptolémaïques comparées ou identifiées à des déesses (IIIe–Ier siècles avant J.-C.)" *Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie—Alexandrie* (37, 1948), 12–33.
László Török, "Amasis and Ergamenes" *Studia Aegyptiaca* 14 (1992), 555–561.
———, "The history of the Dodekaschoenos between ca. 250 BC and 298 AD" *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache* 107 (1980), 76–86.
Charles C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (Chicago, 1910).
Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Large-scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources" in Adrian Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Atlanta, 2003), 121–144.
———, "The rabbinic tradition concerning the 'alterations' inserted into the Greek translation of the Torah and their relation to the original text of the Septuagint" in Emanuel Tov (ed.), *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden, 1999 [= *Vetus Testamentum* supplement 72]), 1–20.
Sterling Tracy, "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: a Study" *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928), 241–252.
J. Tréheux, "Cleino à Délos" *ChrÉg* 32 (1957), 147–151.
H.A. Troxell, "The Peloponnesian Alexanders" *ANSMN* 17 (1971), 41–94.
Lana Troy, "Good and Bad Women: Maxim 18/284–288 of the Instructions of Ptahhotep" *Göttinger Miszellen* 80 (1984), 77–81.
Sterling Tracy "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: a Study" *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928), 241–252.
Phyllis Trible, *God and the rhetoric of sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978 [= Overtures to biblical theology, 2]).
Kristin de Troyer, *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1–17, LXX 8:1–17, and AT 7:14–41* (Atlanta, GA, 2000 [= Septuagint and Cognate Studies monograph series, 48]).
J. Trumpf, see Reinhold Merkelbach.
Matthew F. Trundle, *Greek Mercenaries: from the Late Archaic Age to Alexander the Great* (London and New York, 2004).

Jennifer Ann Tunny, "The Health of Ptolemy II Philadelphus" *BASP* 38 (2001), 119–134.
———, "Ptolemy "the Son" Reconsidered: Are there too Many Ptolemies?" *ZPE* 131 (2000), 83–92.
C.J. Tuplin, "Xenophon and the garrisons of the Achaemenid Empire" *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* n.s. 20 (1987), 167–245.
E.G. Turner, "Ptolemaic Egypt" in F.W. Walbank et al. (eds.), *CAH* 7.1 (second edition, Cambridge, 1984), 118–174.
Fritz Uebel, "Die Jenaer Papyrussammlung" in Deborah H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (Toronto, 1970 [= American Studies in Papyrology, 7]), 491–495.
E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Grand Rapids and Leiden, 1999)
Riet Van Bremen, "Ptolemy at Panamara" *Epigraphica Anatolica* 35 (2003), 9–14.
Vera F. Vanderlip, *The Four Greek Hymns of Isidorus and the Cult of Isis* (Toronto, 1972 [= American Studies in Papyrology, 12]).
E. Vanderpool, J.R. McCredie and A. Steinberg, "Koroni: the Date of the Camp and the Pottery" *Hesperia* 33 (1964), 69–75.
E. Vanderpool, J.R. McCredie and A. Steinberg, "Koroni: a Ptolemaic Camp on the East Coast of Attica" *Hesperia* 31 (1962), 26–61.
Jacque Vandier, *Le papyrus Jumilhac* (Paris, 1961).
Katelijn Vandorpe, see Willy Clarysse.
H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe* (Paris, 1948 [= Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 163]).
Peter Van Nuffelen, "Le culte des souverains hellénistiques, le gui de la religion grecque" *Ancient Society* 29 (1998–1999), 175–189.
E. van 't Dack, see W. Peremans.
Eirene Varucha-Christodoulopoulou, Συμβολὴ εἰς τὸν Χρεμωνίδειον πόλεμον 266/5–263/2 π. Χ. *AE* 3 (1953/4), 321–349.
Eleni Vassilika, *Ptolemaic Philae* (Leuven, 1989 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta, 34])
Anne-Emmanuelle Véïsse, *Les 'révoltes égyptiennes': recherches sur les troubles intérieurs en Egypte du règne de Ptolémée III à la conquête romaine* (Leuven, 2004).
G. van der Veken, see Willy Clarysse.
Giuseppe Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1994 [= Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 41]).
Arthur M.F.W. Verhoogt, *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris: the Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120–110 BC)* (Leiden, 1998 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 29]).
———, *Regaling Officials in Ptolemaic Egypt: a Dramatic Reading of Official Accounts from the Menches Papers* (Leiden, 2005 [= Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 32]).
Anne-Marie Vérilhac and Claude Vial, *Le mariage grec: du VIe siècle av. J.-C. à l'époque d'Auguste* (Paris, 1998 [= *BCH* supplement 32]).
Pascal Vernus, *Essai sur la conscience de l'histoire dans l'Egypte pharaonique* (Paris, 1995 [= Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études. Sciences historiques et philologiques, 332]).

Claude Vial, see Anne-Marie Vérilhac.
Francis Vian (ed.) and Emile Delage (trans.), *Apollonios de Rhodes Argonautiques* (vols. 1–3, Paris, 1974–1981).
Ladislav Vidman, *Isis und Sarapis bei den Griechen und Römern. Epigraphische Studien zur Verbreitung und zu den Trägern des ägyptischen Kultes* (Berlin, 1970 [= Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 29]).
———, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* (Berlin, 1969 [= Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 28]).
Y.G. Vinogradov, "An Ostracon from the Taganrog Settlement" *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia: an International Journal of Comparative Studies in History and Archaeology* 6 (1999), 13–18.
Steve Vinson, "The Accent's on Evil: Ancient Egyptian 'Melodrama' and the Problem of Genre" *JARCE* 41 (2004), 33–54.
———, "They-Who-Must-Be-Obeyed: Arsake, Rhadopis and Tabubue; Ihweret and Charikleia" forthcoming in *Comparative Literature Studies* 45.3 (2008).
Biagio Virgilio, "Eumenes I e i mercenari di Filetereia e di Attaleia" *Studi Classici e Orientali* (1983), 97–140 and plates IV to VIII.
Günter Vittmann, *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend* (Mainz, 2003 [= Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt, 97]).
———, "Die Autobiographie der Tathotis (Stele Wien 5857)" *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 22 (1995), 283–323.
S.P. Vleeming, *Some Coins of Artaxerxes and other Short Texts in the Demotic Script Found on Various Objects and Gathered from many Publications* (Leuven, 2001 [= Studia Demotica, 5]).
Youri Volokhine, see Philippe Borgeaud.
Sitta von Reden, *Money in Early Ptolemaic Egypt from the Macedonian Conquest to the End of the Third Century BC* (Cambridge, 2007).
Epaminondas A. Vranopoulos, "War elephants of the Hellenistic period" *Platon* 27 (1975), 130–146 (summary in English).
Werner Vycichl, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte* (Leuven, 1984).
A.J.B. Wace, "Laconia: Excavations at Sparta 1906" *BSA* 14 (1907/8), 149–158.
B.Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: a Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati, 1974).
Elaine M. Wainwright, *Women Healing/Healing Women: the Genderisation of Healing in Early Christianity* (London, 2006).
F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen and R.M. Ogilvie (eds.), *CAH* (second edition vol. 7 part 1, Cambridge, 1984).
F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (three vols., Oxford, 1957–1979).
———, "Sea-Power and the Antigonids" in W. Lindsay Adams and Eugene N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Lanham, 1982), 213–236.
———, see also N.G.L. Hammond.
Susan Walker and Peter Higgs (eds.), *Cleopatra of Egypt from History to Myth* (London, 2001).
Howard Wallace, *The Eden Narrative* (Atlanta, 1985 [= Harvard Semitic Monographs, 32]).
N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos: Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und*

zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur (Berlin, 1964 [= Texte und Untersuchungen, 86]).
David J. Wasserstein, review of Nina L. Collins *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (Leiden and Boston, 2000) *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22 (2003), 318–320.
F. Watson, "Strategies of Recovery and Resistance: Hermeneutical Reflections on Genesis 1–3 and its Pauline Reception" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 45 (1992), 79–103.
Barbara Watterson, *Women in Ancient Egypt* (New York, 1991).
Gregor Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft*, (Stuttgart, 1993 [= *Hermes* Einzelschriften 62]).
Hans van Wees, *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities* (London, 2004).
Otto Weinreich, "Zur hellenistisch-aegyptischen Religionsgeschichte" *Aegyptus* 11 (1931),13–22.
C. Bradford Welles, "Gallic Mercenaries in the Chremonidean War" *Klio* 52 (1970), 471–490.
———, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: a Study in Greek Epigraphy* (London, 1934).
Louise Wells, *The Greek Language of Healing from Homer to New Testament Times* (Berlin, 1998 [= Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 83]).
Derek A. Welsby, *The Kingdom of Kush: the Napatan and Meroitic Empires* (London, 1996).
Willemina Wendrich, see Steven E. Sidebotham.
Edward Wente (trans.), "The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood" in William K. Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 104–107.
Edward Wente (trans.), "The Contendings of Horus and Seth" in William K. Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 91–103.
Edward Wente (trans.), "The Report of Wenamun" in William K. Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 116–124.
Edward Wente (trans.), "The Tale of the Doomed Prince" in William K. Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 75–79.
Edward Wente (trans.), "The Tale of Two Brothers" in William K. Simpson, et al., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (third edition, New Haven, 2003), 80–90.
William Linn Westermann, "Enslaved Persons who are Free" *AJP* 59.1 (1938), 1–30.
John William Wevers, "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies" *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 18 (1985), 16–38.
———, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, 1993 [= Septuagint and cognate studies series, 35]).
P.V. Wheatley, "Lamia the Besieger: an Athenian Hetaera and a Macedonian

King" in Olga Palagia and Stephen V. Tracy (eds.) *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 BC* (Oxford, 2003), 30–36.
———, "The Lifespan of Demetrius Poliorcetes" *Historia* 46.1 (1997), 19–27.
———, "The Mint at Tyre after the Battle of Ipsus" in Waldemar Heckel and Lawrence A. Tritle (eds.), *Crossroads of History: the Age of Alexander* (Claremont, 2003), 183–216.
Ulrich Wilcken, "Die Berliner Papyrusgrabungen in Herakleopolis Magna im Winter 1898/9" *ArchPF* 2 (1903), 294–336.
———, "Papyrus-Urkunden" *ArchPF* 8 (1927), 63–104.
———, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde)* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1927).
D. Wildung, see G. Grimm.
Edouard Will, *Histoire Politique du Monde Hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C)* (2 vols., Nancy, 1979–1982).
M.F. Williams, "The Character of Aeëtes in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius" *Hermes* 124 (1996), 463–479.
Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca and London, 1995).
Penelope Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon: a Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu* (Leuven, 1997 [= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 78]).
John J. Winkler, see Susan A. Stephens.
J.K. Winnicki, "Bericht von einem Feldzug des Ptolemaios Philadelphos in der Pithom-Stele" *JJurP* 20 (1990), 157–167.
———, "Carrying off and Bringing Home the Statues of the Gods: on an Aspect of the Religious Policy of the Ptolemies towards the Egyptians" *JJurP* 24 (1994), 149–190.
D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: a New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York, 1981 [= Anchor Bible, 43]).
Erich Winter, "Ergamenes II., seine Datierung und seine Bautätigkeit in Nubia" *MDAIK* 37 (1981), 509–513.
J.R. Wiseman, "A trans-Isthmian Fortification Wall: Notes on Hellenistic Military Operations in the Corinthia" *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 248–275.
Michael Wörrle, "Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens I." *Chiron* 7 (1977), 43–66.
———, "Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II: Ptolemaios II. und Telmessos" *Chiron* 8 (1978), 201–246.
———, "Telmessos in hellenistischer Zeit" in *Actes du Colloque sur la Lycie antique* (Paris, 1980), 63–72.
Serge Yalichev, *Mercenaries of the Ancient World* (London, 1997).
J. Yoyotte, see P. Charvet.
Louis V. Žabkar, *Hymns to Isis in Her Temple at Philae* (Hanover and London, 1988).
Graham Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* (London, 1987).
Karl-Theodor Zauzich, "Von Elephantine bis Sambehedet" *Enchoria* 12 (1984), 193–194.
———, "Die schlimme Geschichte von dem Mann der Gottesmutter, der ein Gespenst war" *Enchoria* 6 (1976), 79–82.
Donald J. Zeyl, *Plato: Timaeus* (Indianapolis, 2000).

Christiane Ziegler, *The Pharaohs* (New York, 2002).
Konrat Ziegler, *Das Hellenistische Epos: ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung* (second edition, Leipzig, 1966).
Ronald E. Zitterkopf, see Steven E. Sidebotham.
G. Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies II: Aristeas on the Translation of the Torah" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4 (1959), 109–126.

GENERAL INDEX

Aalders, G.J.D., 157n27
Abel, F.M., 173n2
Abu Sir al-Malaq, 183n4, 184–185
Adam, 216–217, 219–222
Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin, 62n102
Adams, William Y., 135n3
Adcock, F.E., 39n2, 102n76
Adelphoi theoi (θεοὶ ἀδελφοί), 58–59, 278, 298–299, 398, 400–401, 405
Adulis, 141
Aetos, 59, 61
Aegean, ix, 3, 28, 40, 42, 43n13, 47–50, 59–63, 80, 85–89, 108, 119, 135, 138–139, 155
Agathē Tuchē, 151
Agathocleia, courtesan of Philadelphus 357, 384
Agathocleia, courtesan of Philopator 357, 368, 379–385
Agathocles 380, 383–384
Ager, Sheila L., 154n20, 155n22, 159n34, 295, 298n34, 300n39
Aglais 360–363
Aietes, 149, 151, 157, 159–163, 165–168
Akrotatos, 67, 83
al-Hiba, 183n4, 184–185, 188–189
Albersmeier, S., 399n69
Albis, Robert V., 150n5
Alcinous, 149, 151, 156–168
Alexander II son of Pyrrhus, 101
Alexander Jannaeus, 206
Alexander king of Epirus, 82–83, 86
Alexander the Aetolian, 10
Alexander the Great, 9, 11, 17, 23, 29, 52, 54, 56–58, 67, 88, 103–106, 110, 112–115, 119, 122, 136, 140, 153, 156, 163, 248, 275, 298–299, 301, 341n160, 354–356, 389, 398
Alexander the Molossian, 96
Alexandria
  administration, 35, 137
  and Cyprus, 45
  and Cyrenaica, 44
  and Egypt, 24, 27, 41, 119
  and Greece, 42
  centre of an Empire, 50–51, 61–62
  court, 358
  Dionysia, 18
  Ecclesiasticus written at, 245, 265
  games, 31
  Jews in, 194, 197–198, 200–203, 212, 228–229, 235, 239, 243, 254
  library, 193, 231n73, 249, 251, 255
  museum, 2, 10–14, 21, 23–24, 27, 51, 120, 229, 299
  serapieion, 390, 393–395, 400–408
  symposia, 21
Alexandrian geography, 11, 51, 137, 147
Alexandrian canon 254
Alexandrianism, 3, 9, 12, 23–24
Allen, Thomas G., 331n108
Allison, Dale C. Jr., 244n62
Amandry, P., 60
Ameling, W., 49n45, 55n73
Amphilochus of Olenus, 363–365
Andersson, E., 280n18
animals, veneration of, 286, 389
Antagoras of Rhodes, 1
Antigone, wife of Pyrrhus, 94–95
Antigonos Gonatas 1–2, 48n43, 63–67, 69, 71–89
Antipatros, 47n35, 76, 85–86
Antiochos I, 28, 99–102, 141, 359
Antiochus II, 28, 53n64, 64, 382
Antiochos III, 145
Aphrodite, 43, 51, 151
  as Isis, 388, 399

-Arsinoe, 58–60, 399
-Kypris, 58
-Euploia, 59
-Bilistiche, 367, 374–375
aphorologetoi, 56
aphrouretoi, 56
Apis, 283, 286, 313n34, 330–333, 389–392, 395, 404, 407
apoikiai, 104
Apollo, 44n22, 51, 55, 84, 107–108, 122, 134n77, 257, 357
Apollonios the dioketes, 31–34, 37, 43, 396–397, 403–405
Apollonius Rhodius 4, 10, 53, 119, 149–150, 156, 158, 168
Apollophanes, 176
Apsyrtus, 149n2, 157, 159, 162, 164–165, 168
Aradus, 171
Aratos, leader of Sikyon, 64
Aratos of Soloi, 1
Aratus 10, 167
Archagathus the *epistates*, 359
aretalogy, 320–325, 338
arete, 44n22, 57–58, 60n95, 158, 161, 163–164, 167, 227n59
Areus, king of Sparta, 65, 67, 69, 71, 75, 78
Argos, 51, 100, 130
Aristarchus, 10
Aristeas, 21, 193–199, 204, 212–230, 234–246, 248–249
Aristobulus of Alexandria, 214, 229
Aristonikos (pugilist), 62
Aristonikos (king), 107
Aristotle, 113, 178, 212n23, 213–214, 227n59, 231
Aristoxenus, 10
Arrheneides, 86
Arsake, 350
Arsinoe I 379
Arsinoe II 19, 33, 41, 45–46, 49, 51, 58–61, 355–356, 359–360, 68, 70–71, 100–101, 120, 154n17, 276–283, 285, 291, 293, 297–301, 337n137, 347, 355–356, 359–360, 367, 372, 375, 379–382, 387, 395, 398–405
Arsinoe III 300, 380, 382–383, 408n111
Arsinoe (cities) 50, 61, 63, 66
Arsinoë, *see* Arsinoe
Arsinoe-Aphrodite, 60
Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Kypris-(Zephyritis), 58
Arsonoeion, 406–407
Arsinoite nome, *see* Fayum
Artapanus, 212, 244
Asclepiades, poet, 10, 358–360, 373
Asklepiades, a banker, , 185n12
Asclepius, 261–262, 270–271
Asklepius, *see* Asclepius
Asoka, 44, 50n51, 64, 248
Aspendos, 59, 61n96, 396
Assmann, Jan, 303n2, 313n33, 314n36, 315n42, 322n68, 331n113, 332n116, 335n125, 343n165, 346, 389n9
Astour, M., 130
Athens, , 60–95, 101, 122, 131, 225, 231, 292, 368
Atreids 56, 372
Attalos I, 105
Attalos III, 107
Atum, 280–281
Austin, C., 47, 56, 87n93, 88, 95n35, 105–106, 113–114, 143n31
Austin, M.M., 102
autonomoi 56
Avalos, H., 257–258, 260–263
Avi-Yonah, M., 178

Bacchylides, 21
Badian, E., 98n49
Baer, Richard A., 210n15
Bagnall, Roger S., 42n13, 43–44, 46–49, 56n74, 61n96, 105–107, 135, 154n18, 155n24, 294n12, 359n36, 395n47, 402n86
Baines, John, 304n2, 305n8, 310n21, 312n27, 313n31, 388
Bal, Mieke, 216n37, 303n2, 304n3, 306n11, 309n20
banquet, *see symposion*

Barb, A.A., 122
Barclay, John M.G., 198, 200, 235
Bar-Kochva, Bezalel, 107, 235–236, 239
Barnes, M.H., 150
Barthélemy, D., 197n5
basilistai, 401–402
Bastianini, G., 62n102, 355n10, 362, 367
Baumgartner, A.J., 205
Bauslaugh, R., 110
Beck, Roger, 183n1, 207n1, 320n58, 323n73
Beckerath, Jürgen von, 183n1, 296n21
Beloch, K.J., 42n13, 72
Bengtson, Hermann, 105, 300
Bennett, Chris, 354, 356n13, 357, 359–362, 365–385
Benseler, G., 369n87
Berenice I 18–19, 44n23, 54n69, 94, 152–153, 353–356, 367, 370, 394, 400
Berenice II 44n23, 121, 367, 382, 395, 408n111
Berenice Phernophorus 367, 382
Berenice, canephore 378
Berenike (harbour), 143, 189–190
Berenike Hormos, 282
Bergemann, J., 175
Bergman, Jan, 321n61
Bergmeier, Roland, 321n47
Berlandini, Jocelyne, 333n119
Bernal, Martin, 126n30, 133–134
Bernand, André, 408n111
Bernand, Etienne, 392, 394–395, 400n75
Bernstein, M., 353
Berthold, M., 48n43
Bertram, G., 205
Berve, Helmut, 353n1
Beth Guvrin, 179
Bevan, E., 53, 84n78, 354n2, 371n98
Beye, Charles Rowan, 150n5
Beyer-Rotthoff, Brigitte, 135
Bichler, R., 15
Bickerman, Elias J., 206
Bilistiche, 353–385
Billows, R.A., 104
Bing, Peter, 58n86
Bingen, Jean, 188n22, 280n19, 373
Bion, 2, 10, 142n35
Bird, Phyllis A., 261
Blackman, Aylward M., 304n3, 305n6, 318n50, 319n56, 336n131
Bledstein, Adrien Janis, 260
Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, 305, 312, 341
Blumenthal, Elke, 316n42
Boardman, John, 175
Boeotia, 369
Bommas, Martin, 288n4, 390–393, 402
Book of the Temple, 288
Borgeaud, Philippe, 390n18, 393–394, 403n93
Borghouts, J.F., 316n45
Bouché-Leclerq, A., 50n49, 361n45
Bousquet, J., 55n74
Bowker, J., 203
Bowman, Alan K., 36n37, 294n14
Brady, Thomas Allan, 388n4, 402
Braund, David, 103, 163n46
Bresciani, Edda, 34n29
bread tax, 278
Briant, Pierre, 297n29
Bricco, 80
Bringmann, Klaus, 84n80, 87n93
Brock, S.P., 197
Brown, William P., 209–210
Brugsch, Heinrich, 303n1, 351
Brun, P., 50n45, 59n87
Bruneau, P., 48n43, 49n45, 59n87, 404n99
Bryaxis, 392
bull, 162, 174, 283, 312, 326, 329–332, 337, 389, 391, 407
Buraselis, Kostas, 41n8, 48n39, 52n61, 72n35, 73n36, 101n70, 376, 379
Burkard, Günter, 322n69, 328n94, 330n100, 335n130
Burstein, Stanley M., 34n29, 45n27, 46n29, 50n47, 52n59, 56n73,

136n7, 137n16, 138n19, 139n23, 143n44, 147n61, 155n23
Burton, A., 129n48, 132n71
Byre, Calvin S., 150n5

Caccamo Caltabiano, M., 44n23
Cadell, H., 382n153
Cairns, F., 16–17
Callimachus, 10, 16–18, 51, 95, 150–151, 291n5, 374
Callixeinos of Rhodes, 19
Calypso, 176
Cambyses, 140, 297n29
Cameron, Alan, xi, 16–17, 150, 358–360, 365–367, 372–375, 380–382
Caminos, Ricardo A., 285n32
Camp, Claudia V., 266, 269n39
Campbell, Malcolm, 161
canal, 50, 142–143, 278, 281–282, 404, 406
canephore, 64, 359–360, 367–372, 377–378, 380, 382
Canfora, L., 9n2, 15n3
Canopus, 53, 59, 120, 286, 289, 367, 390
Cantarella, M., 227n59
Cappelletto, P., 58n84
Caria, 28n4, 46–47, 52, 63, 67, 296n29
Carlotti, J.-F., 275n3
Carney, Elizabeth D., 94n24, 295
Carthage, 93n15, 97–102, 155
Cartledge, P., 15n3, 68n10
cartonnage, 35–36, 184–186, 188
Cassander, 94
Cary, Max, 103
Casson, Lionel, 141n32, 189, 190
Castiglione, L., 393n35
Cerberus, 175, 177, 392
Cerný, J., 126n34, 294, 298
Chambers, Mortimer, 101n71
Chamoux, F., 44n23, 60n94
Chaniotis, Angelos, 104–107, 113–114
chariots, *see* horses
Charles, R.H., 194
Charlesworth, J.H., 251n3, 253n5, 264n23
Charvet, P., 60n94
Chassinat, Emile, 126–127, 336
Chatman, Seymour, 303n2, 304, 318n52
Choerilus, 17
Chremonides, 47n35, 66–73, 83, 87, 101
Chremonidean War, 28, 44n23, 45n27, 47–49, 57, 59, 63, 65–89, 153n12
Christensen, Thorolf, 36n35
Chronicle of Prince Osorkon, 285
chronographers, 203, 250–252, 255
Cicero, 229
Clagett, Marshall, 120n5
Clare, R.J., 150n5, 165n55
Clarysse, Willy, 3, 30n8, 188n18, 378n75, 380n140, 397n57, 403n94
Clauss, James J., 150n5, 163n48
Cleino, 357, 359
Clements, Ronald E., 266
Cleopatra I, 44n22, 233
Cleopatra II, 235, 383–385
Cleopatra III, 383, 408n111
Cleopatra VII, 12, 119, 300, 347n172
Cleopatra Thea, 383
Clermont-Ganneau, Charles, 173
Clitarchus, 354
Cloché, P., 67n6, 83n73
Coele-Syria, 40, 42n13, 43
Coenen, Marc, 326n87
Cohen, Getzel M., 104
Collins, J.J., 200–201, 213
Collins, Nina, 199, 229–230, 248–249
Colotes, 11
Compton, Michael T., 270
Conder, C.R., 173
Contendings of Horus and Seth, 132, 315–316, 336, 341
Cook, A.B., 130
Cook, Johann, 199, 203–206, 210, 212
Cooper, Frederick A., 108
Copleston, Frederick A., 213–214
Corinth, 55n73, 57–58, 78–79, 82–83, 270

Cornford, Francis M., 213n27
Corteggiani, J.P., 387
corvée, , 29
Cos, 37, 47–48, 64, 84–89, 130, 270
courtesans, 353–385
cow, 326, 329–332, 340–341, 395n49
Crampa, Jonas, 379
Crawford, Dorothy J., 35n32, 389n10, 399n70
creation, 208–220, 223–228
Criscuolo, Lucia, 57n83, 58n86, 61n97, 291, 366n67, 367n68, 378n72
Curupedium, 300
Cyclades, 43, 48–49, 52, 401
Cyprus, 39–47, 52, 54, 58n86, 59–60, 64, 313, 354
Cyrene, 28, 39, 44, 54n69, 60, 235, 299, 384
Cyrenaica, 11, 39n3, 42–44, 54, 63, 299

Daimachus, 11
Darius I, 142, 163n47, 240
Darius II, 236n25
David, Ephraim, 83n75, 84n81
Davidson, James N., 112
Davies, J.K., 88n96
Davies, P.R., 103, 247, 250
Deïdameia, 93
deification, 27
Delos, 19, 43n13, 48n43, 49n45, 58n86, 59–64, 84–85, 107–108, 357, 393, 404
Delphi, 58n85, 60–61, 63, 67, 111
Demand, Nancy, 258
Demeter, 122–123, 127–132, 158n33, 338
Demetrios, 32, 43, 48, 55n72, 58, 60n94, 71, 82, 190
Demetrius of Phalerum, 212, 229, 231
Demetrius Poliorcetes, 91, 93, 95, 140, 355–356, 359–361, 379
Demetrius Polioketes, 231n76
Demetrius the Chronographer, 203, 251
Demonice, 370
Depauw, Mark, 339n147, 340–342
Derchain, Philippe, 120n5, 278n13
Derow, Peter, 41n6, 105, 107, 154n18
Desanges, Jehan, 137n12, 141n34
Deuteronomistic History, 247, 251, 253, 255
Didymus 10
Didyme, 357–360, 371
diegesis, 195
Dieleman, Jacco, 303n2, 316n45, 322n67, 343n164, 349n183
Dietze, Gertrud, 139n25
Di Lella, Alexander A., 265, 268n36
Dimant, Devorah, 245n64
Dindorf, Ludwig, 369n87
Dines, Jennifer M., 22n19, 194, 198n6, 200–201, 229n67
Dinsmoor, W.B., 86
Diogeiton, 69–70
Diogenes Laertius, 229, 355n8
Dionysia, 18, 23
Dionysius Periegetes, 11
Dionysos, 18, 31, 56n79, 57, 122, 129–132, 151, 178, 392, 407
Dionysus, *see* Dionysos
Djoser, 282, 288
Dodekaschoinos, 139
Domingo Gygax, Marc, 379
Dorival, G., 196
Dousa, Thomas M., 322n67, 325n86
Dowden, Ken, 341n160
Dreyer, Boris, 68n13, 69, 70n24, 72–73, 76n49, 77n50, 85n85, 86n90
Droysen, Gustav, 15
Duggan, Michael W., 240n46
Dunand, Françoise, 314n35, 337n135, 400n78, 405n101
Duris, 10
Duttenhöfer, Ruth, 399n72

Edgar, C.C., 171, 368n72, 370, 405n104
Egger, Brigitte, 348n179
Eide, Tormod, 135
elephants, 4, 28, 50–53, 81, 85, 98, 115, 135, 140–147, 154, 174–

175, 178, 188–190, 235, 283, 292
Eleusis, , 72, 76–77, 122–125, 128–129, 131, 133–134, 235, 357, 359
eleutheroi, 56
Elias, N., 23
Eliot, C.W., 77n53
Elpinice, 292
Empereur, Jean-Yves, 387n1
Engelmann, Helmut, 393n38
Engsheden, Åke, 275n2
Ennius, 16
epimeleia, 56
Epimenes, a cleruch 186–187
Eratosthenes 10, 51n53, 137, 231n73, 249–251
Eirene, daughter of Ptolemy I, 354
Eirene, courtesan of Ptolemy VIII, 384–385
Ergamenes/Arqamani-qo, 144, 147
Erman, Adolf, 124n25, 131n60
erotikos, 21
Errington, R.M., 94n23
Erskine, Andrew, 101n73
Estes, J. Worth, 262–263, 268n36, 270–271
Etienne, R., 57n82, 61n97, 72n35, 73n36
Etruscan, 128, 131n61
Euergetism, 88
Eugnomon, 21
Eumenes I, 105–115
Eumolpos, 128–133
eunoia, 56, 60n95
Eunostus of Soli, 354
Euphorion, 10
Euploia, *see* Aphrodite
Eupolemos of Caria, 105
Eupolemos (Jew), 251n3
Eurydice, 43, 45, 356
Eurynoe, 292
Eve, 221–223
Exodus, 195, 241–246, 258
Ezekiel the Tragedian, 212

Fairman, Herbert W., 317n48, 318n50, 319n56, 336
Falivene, Maria Rosaria, 183–189
Fantuzzi, M., 19, 62n103, 362n46, 367n68
Faulkner, Raymond O., 133n75, 317n49, 318n51, 329n97, 334
Fauth, Wolgang, 393n40
Fayum, 30, 33, 35, 183, 391n20, 394n45, 403–404
Fayyum, *see* Fayum
Feeney, D.C., 16
Felber, Heinz, 342n162
femme fatale, 312, 338, 348
Ferguson, W.S., 66n4, 69n20, 70n21, 72n31, 76n48, 82n71, 84, 85n83, 101n73
ferry toll, 278
Fernández Marcos, N., 196, 213n26, 230n70, 231–232, 248n2
Février, J.-G., 194, 239–240, 246
Fields, Nick, 108
Fine, John V.A., 92n6, 103
first person narration, 303–305, 309–347
Fisher, Marjorie, 307n13
Fitzgerald, M.P.V., 54n71
Fleischer, H.L., 124
Flint, P.W., 252
Foertmeyer, Victoria, 101n68
Foucart, Paul, 122–123, 131, 133n72
Fränkel, Hermann, 150
Frankfurter, David, 314n37, 315n43
Frazer, Alfred, 49, 131n59
Fraser, P.M., 1, 18
Frier, Bruce W., 295n12
frogs, 133
Frymer-Kensky, Tikva, 269

Gabbert, J.J., 47n35, 65, 68n13, 100n61
Gabiene, 115
Gaca, Kathy L., 213n27, 225n56, 226n58
Gagarin, Michael, 154n19
game, 13, 27, 31, 62, 108, 155, 300, 316n45, 336, 354, 389
Gardiner, Alan H., 127, 305n8, 311n26, 312, 316, 320, 315, 327

Gardonisi, 72, 74
Garland, Robert, 71
Gaudard, François, 318n49
Gauls, 80–81, 95n37, 105
Gaza, 115, 140
George, B., 275n3
Gerleman, G., 205
Gifford, E.H., 202
Gillam, Robyn A., 317n49
Glanville, Stephen R.K., 327n90
Glauce, 359–360, 363–365
Glaukon, 57, 61, 71–74
goat, 130, 185, 276–279
Goedicke, Hans, 280n18
Goldhill, Simon, 150n5
Gomaà, Farouk, 183n1, 307n13
Gonzales, Matthew Paul, 107
Gordon, Richard L., 323n74
Goshen-Gottstein, A., 251
Gow, A.S.F., 19n12, 145n53, 152, 153n14, 358, 361–363, 365n60, 375, 381n147
Gowers, Sir William, 145n53
Goyon, Jean-Claude, 317n49, 319n56, 327, 333n121, 340n157
Grabe, J.E., 255
Grainger, John D., 43n16
Grandjean, Yves, 320n58, 321n60
Grant, Michael, 109
Grapow, Hermann, 124n25, 131n60
Great Procession, 50, 52, 56, 145
Green, Peter, 53n67, 94n24, 103, 108, 120n3, 149n2, 150n3, 154n17, 229n62, 231n76, 292, 295n18
Grenfell, Bernard P., 184–185, 325n86
Gregory of Nazianzus, 10
Griffith, Francis Llewellyn, 303, 308, 312, 316, 327n92, 330, 334n123, 336n132, 338, 340n158, 343n164
Griffith, G.T., 1, 95n31, 100, 103–108, 111–112, 115
Griffiths, Frederick T., 95n37
Griffiths, J. Gwyn, 124n26, 126n31, 127, 132n65, 326n88, 329n95, 331n111, 333n122, 335n126, 342n161, 349n182, 350n186
Grimal, Nicolas, 53, 296
Grimm, Günter, 389n4, 390n17, 398n62, 399n64, 400–402
Gruen, Erich, 92, 98n49, 100, 155n21, 244, 245n63
Gryneion, 107–108
Grzybek, Erhard, 68, 101n72, 280n19, 382n154
Guillaume, Philippe, 250
Guilmot, Max, 125n27, 126n31
Gulick, C.B., 361n45, 372n104
Gutzwiller, Kathryn J., 62n102

Habermann, Wolfgang, 184n10
Habicht, Christian, 46n29, 47, 57n83, 59n91, 66n2, 69n16, 71–76, 100n59, 153n12, 398n59, 401n82
Hacham, Noah, 243
Hadas, Moses, 196, 234–235, 238–241, 246–248
Haikal, Fayza Mohamed Hussein, 317n49, 319n55
hairesis, 55
Halikarnassos, 402–403, 405
halikê, 31
Halperin, David M., 95n37
Hammond, N.G.L., 47–48, 57n83, 80–83, 92–100, 103
Handrock, Peter, 184n10
Hani, Jean, 122
Hansen, Esther V., 106
Harder, Richard, 321n61
Hardie, A., 16
Hardie, Ph. R., 16
Harpokrates, 276, 327, 332, 343, 392n27, 395
Harpoon nome, 281–282, 320, 336
Harrington, Daniel, 265n24
Harsaphes / Herakles, 187
Harsiyotef, 136
Harsomtus, 280
Hathor, 331–332, 337–340
Hatzopoulos, Miltiades B., 369n87
Hauben, Hans, 45n27, 48n43, 58n86, 61n97, 66n3, 68n11, 96n39, 101n75, 299n36, 301,

357n21, 369n75, 382n157, 384n165, 399n66
Haüssler, R., 15n4
Haynes, Katharine, 348n178
Hazzard, R.A., 54, 55n72, 156n26, 292n7, 294, 368n72, 381n147
Head, Barclay V., 67n8
healing, , 108, 132, 257–272, 392, 395, 407
Hecataeus of Abdera, 23, 123, 231, 235
Hedylus, 363–364
Heidenreich, M., 9n1
Heidorn, Lisa, 138n21
Heinen, Heinz, 19n11, 46–53, 68–71, 81n69, 85n84, 86–87, 99n53, 146n57
Heliodorus, 348–350
Heliopolis, 282, 297
Hellespont, 40, 49
helper, 219
Hengel, Martin, 193, 200, 202, 205n13, 212n24, 230–231, 264n24
Hephaestion, 10
Hera Zugiē, 160
Héral, S., 30
Herakleopolis Magna, 183–190
Herakles 18, 53n67, 57, 187
Herman, Gabriel, 110
Hermias, 61, 180, 233
Herondas, 21
Hesiod, 11, 119, 151, 165
Heyne, Christian Gottlob, 9–10, 12–15, 23–24
Hicks, Cadmus Metcalf, 83n75
Hiera Nesos, Herakleopolite, 188–189
Hieron of Syracuse, 21
Hieronymus of Cardia, 1
hieros gamos, 399
Higgs, Peter, 337n137
Hippe, 360–363
Hippocratic tradition, 225
Hippothontis, 69
historici, 11
Hoenes, Sigrid-Eike, 337n138, 340n155
Hofmann, Beate, 287n41
Hölbl, Günther, 42n12, 48n42, 54n64, 84n79, 85n85, 87n92, 156n25, 275n1, 294n14, 297–300, 388–390, 396–405
Holladay, C.R., 200, 202–203, 212
Holmberg, Maj Sandmann, 330
Hombert, M., 294n12, 295n18
homonoia, 57, 63, 73, 159
Honigman, Sylvie, 193n1, 194–198, 235n16, 238, 242–244, 248–249
Hopkins, K., 294n12, 295
Horbury, William, 233–234
Hornbostel, Wilhelm, 392n30
Hornung, Erik, 330n105, 332n18, 338n140
horses, 52n61, 138, 174, 361–362, 373–375
Householder, Fred W. Jr., 143n43
House of Life, 120, 327n92
Hunter, R., 17–20, 138–139, 150, 152n9, 154n16, 156n25, 165, 381
Hurry, Jamieson B., 262n20
Huss, Werner, 46n32, 91n1, 135, 147n62, 275n1, 276n6, 278n11, 281n23, 282n28, 287, 360n40, 376n121, 377, 379–380, 388n3, 392n29, 398n61
Hutchinson, G.O., 150n5
Huxley, G.L., 150n5
Hydrea, , 47
Hygieia, 270–271
Hymn to the Inundation, 278

Idumaea 171–181
Ihnasija el-Medina, *see* Herakleopolis
Ijsewijn, Jozef, , 368n72, 380n140
Ilan, Tal, 259–260
image of God, 216–217, 219–220
Imhotep, 262, 271
Inconnu-Bocquillon, Danielle, 340n157
India, 51, 64, 141, 178
Itanos, 47, 63

interpretatio Graeca, 121–128, 388, 390–391, 395
Ionia, 46, 48, 57, 64, 108
Ipsus, 93, 103, 110, 115, 356
Iseum Campense, 404
Isis at Nymphaion, 51
  at Canopus, 59n86
  and Hera, 120
  and Demeter, 122, 129
  as healer, 132, 270
  at Philae, 139
  and Arsinoe, 151, 280, 285, 293, 297–299, 387
  and Ihweret, 305–351
  and Aphrodite, 388
  and Serapis, 392–408
Ithaca, 384–385

Jacobson, David, 178
Jasnow, Richard, 338, 343n166, 347–348
Jason, 149n2, 156–166
Jason of Pherae, 112
Jellicoe, Sidney, 196–197
Jerusalem, 193–195, 209n5, 229–230, 234, 236–237, 240, 247–251, 254–255, 264, 266, 268
Johne, Renate, 348n179, 349n185
Johnson, Elizabeth A., 271n47
Johnson, Janet H., 303, 342n162
Jones, C.P., 59n91
Jones, J.E., 77n53
Junker, Hermann, 146n58, 317n49

Kahle, P.E., 197
Kalkavage, Peter, 213n28
Kalléris, Jean N., 369n87
Kallias decree, 45, 48, 55, 60n94
Kallikrates of Samos, 44, 58, 60
Kallistratos / Akestias, correspondence of, 188–189
Kallixeinos of Rhodes, 27n1
Kanopos, *see* Canopus
Karabélias, Evangelos, 292n8
Karnak, , 34–36
Kassandros, 66, 72
Katoikiai, 104
Keel, Othmar, 271n47
Keller, Otto, 124
Kerkhecker, Arnd, 22–23
Kern, Otto, 122n15
Kessler, Dieter, 330n102, 331n113, 332n116, 389, 393n36, 400n77
Kheops, 288
Khirbet Za'aquqa, 171, 179–181
King's Novel, 287
Kiss, Zsolt, 390n19
kistē, 128
Kitchen, A., 26
Kitchen, K.A., 183n1
Kittay, Jeffrey, 318n52
Klasens, Adolf, 316n45, 323n75
kleos, 20
klerouchoi, 104
Kloner, Amos, 172, 177–179
Knauf, E.A., 247
Knight, Virginia, 150n5, 158, 163n48
Kobes, J., 46n31
Koch, Roland, 305n7
Koenen, Ludwig, 32n20, 121, 151, 298–300, 347n172
Konstan, David, 348n179
Koptos, 190, 309–310, 334, 343, 349, 391
Kormysheva, Eleonora, 139n27, 140n29, 146n54
Koroni, 47n38, 74–75
Korpela, Jukka, 259n10
Kortenbeutel, Heinz, 141n32
Kos, *see* Cos
Kosmetatou, E., 62n102, 356n11, 358n27, 362n46, 365–373, 376–382
Kratz, R.G., 247
Krebs, W., 190n28
Kugener, Marc-Antoine, 341n160
Kügler, J., 387n39, 388n43
Kurth, Dieter, 331n109
Kurtz, Donnan C., 175
Kush, 4, 136–147
Kyme Text, 321–324
Kyrieleis, H., 401n84
Kypris, *see* Aphrodite
Kyros, 103, 107, 110–114

Lake of Scorpions, 282
Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys, 317–319, 325, 328
Lamia, 353, 355–356, 365, 379
Lamian war, 103–104
Landau, Oscar, 130
Lang, B., 250
Laronde, A., 44n23
Larsson, Gerhard, 250
Launey, Marcel, 52n61, 59, 61n97, 105–107, 113–114, 374n110, 394n45
League of the Islanders, 43, 56, 58n86, 61n96, 64
Lefkowitz, Mary R., 150n3, 259n7
Lenger, Marie-Thérèse, 43n18
Leontiscus 354
Leontopolis, 234
Lesbos, 40, 49n45, 59n87, 63, 108, 267
Levêque, Pierre, 91n4, 94n25
Levy, Jacob, 124
Lewis, David M., *see* Meiggs
Lewis, Naphtali, 103–104, 110, 114, 294n17
library of Alexandria, 2, 10–14, 23–24, 27, 51, 115, 120, 150, 193, 197, 229–231, 248–255
library of Tebtunis, 308, 329–330
Lichtheim, Miriam, 120n5, 303n1, 304n3, 305n6, 308, 311–316, 327n92, 334n123, 336n132, 337n133, 338n146, 341n159, 343n164, 346n170, 347
lighthouse, *see* Pharos
Liverani, Mario, 136n3
Lloyd, A.B., 278n14, 294n14
Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, 16
Loader, William, 5, 215n93, 217n98, 219–220, 223n50
Longega, Gabriella, 45n27
Loomis, William T., 112
Lorton, D., 280n18, 281n23
loutrophori, 175, 177
Lucian, 129, 359
Lüddeckens, Erich, 390n15, 391n24
Lund, Helen S., 96n38
Lycia, 28n4, 43, 46–48, 56, 63
Lycophron, 10
Lysimachos, 66–67, 88, 291
Lysimachus 11, 46, 49, 63, 96, 229n62, 356, 379
Lysistrata, 348

Ma, John, 42n11, 52, 103
Maas, P., 366n60, 377n127, 380
Maat, 280, 306, 312, 331, 335, 343, 346
ma'at, see Maat
Macadam, Miles Frederick Laming, 287
Macedonia, 66–71, 74, 78–80, 82–83, 86–87, 95–101, 135, 291–293, 300, 366, 368–372, 379
Machon, 359–362
MacKay, Pierre, 276n5
Macurdy, Grace Harriet, 101n69, 295n18, 360n40
Magas, 28, 44, 45n25, 50n51, 63–64, 299, 300, 376
Magic Book of Thot, 327, 345
Mahaffy, J.P., 39
Magnetto, Anna, 159n34
Manetho, 10, 23, 230n73, 296–297, 394
Manning, J.G., 36n37, 42, 114, 153n13
Marasco, Gabriele, 66n2, 78n54, 89n58, 81n68, 83n76
Marquaille, Céline, 3, 41n7, 59n90, 62n101, 135n2
marriage
  of sibling, 6, 19, 54, 121, 276, 291–301, 372–385
  diplomatic, 93–95, 282
  secret, 164
  procession, 168
  scarab, 277
  age, 327
  and Osiris, 332, 334
  and *erōs*, 348n179
  of Thais, 354
  sacred, 399
  in Genesis, 220, 225–227, 245

Marrinan, Rafael, 52n61
Marshall, A.J., 159n34
Masson, O., 369–371
Mattha, Girgis, 119n1
Mayassis, S., 124
Mayr, P., 402n91
McCredie, James R., 45n38, 74–81
McKechnie, Paul, 104, 109, 246n73, 255, 264–266
McKenzie, Judith S., 177, 393n39
McKinlay, Judith E., 271n47
McLay, R. Timothy, 230n71
Meecham, Henry G., 196, 237
Medea, 158–166
Meeks, Dimitri, 36n37
Megalopolis, 83, 357
Megara, 80–81, 130–131
Megasthenes, 11
Meiggs, Russell, 110
Meisner, N., 194, 196
Melampus, 129–132
Memnon of Heraclea, 293
Memnon of Rhodes, 110
Memphis, 41, 119, 142–143, 187, 189, 286, 306–309, 321, 330, 349, 389–390, 399–406
menagerie, ix, 178
Menander, 390n14
Menander Rhetor, 16–17
Mendes, 5, 68, 276–287, 300, 399
Menelaos, 45
Menekles, 68–71
Meniste, 370
Mentor of Rhodes, 104
mercenaries, 3, 80, 103–115
Meritt, Benjamin Dean, 68–71, 86n87
Merkelbach, Reinhold, 121, 320n58, 321n61, 323n73, 332n115, 349n182
Merker, I.L., 43n14, 56n75
Merops, 130–132, 138–139
Meroe, 137, 139, 141, 144
Meroitic stelae, 286
Meskell, Lynn, , 294n13
metabolé, 349
Methana-Arsinoe, 47
Metonic cycle, 71
Meulenaere, Herman de, 276n5, 278n15
Meyboom, P.G.P., 174, 178
Middleton, Russell, 294n12
midwife/*maia* 258–271
Miletus, 43, 46, 48, 52, 55–56, 59–60, 63–64, 84
Milesian decree, 55
Min, 391
Minas, Martina, *see* Albersmeier, S.
Miron, 176
misthodotês, 103, 109
mistōr, 124
Mitchell, Lynette G., 110
Mitford, T.B., 44n20, 58n86
Mnesis, , 357
Mnevis, 283, 286
Modrzejewski, Joseph, 292n5, 294, 301n40
Mokhtar, Mohamed Gamal el-Din, 183n2, 187n17
Momigliano, Arnaldo, 15, 377–378
Montet, Pierre, 183n4
Moor, Johannes C. de, 216n36
Moore, David Chioni, 125n28
Mooren, L., 60n93, 99n55
Moretti, Luigi, 359, 366n67, 367n69
Mori, Anatole, 4, 150n5
Moschus, 10
Moscovitch, M.J.
Moses, 200–202, 210, 212, 236, 241–242, 244, 267
  law of, 194, 198–201, 204–205
  see also Ptolemy II Philadelphus
Mossman, J.M., 91n3
Most, G.W., 9n2
Moulton, W.J., 173
Mouseion Hill, 71–73
Mras, K., 202
Mueller, Ulrich B., 257
Muhs, Brian P., 31
Müller, C.W., 130n50
Müller, Mogens, 198n6
Münster, Maria, 222n70, 223, 331n107, 331, 343
Murray, Oswyn, 3, 22n17, 235n16, 238–239, 241n48

Murray, W.M., 51n52
Muss-Arnolt, W., 124n23
Mussies, G., 390n15
Myrtion, 357
μυστήριον, 124

Naneferkaptah, 303–310, 316–317, 327–336, 341–350
Naret-Khentet, 183
Nastasen, 136, 286
neikos, 159, 163–164, 168
Naville, Edouard, 280n18, 142n38
Nearchus, 11
Neatby, Leslie H., 100n64
Nebiim, , 255n8
Neferkasokar, 288
Neith, 122, 284, 331, 350
Nenci, Giuseppe, 92
neokori, 393
Neoptolemus, 93
Nephthys, 297, 317–320, 325–347
Nesiotic League, 46, 48, 60
Nicander 10
Nicholson, Paul, 294n14
Nickelsburg, George W.E., 205n14
Nicolaou, Ino, 44n20, 59n87
Nikaios, Ἀχαιὸς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, 187
Nikouria decree, 55, 63, 155
Niger, 135n3
Nisetich, Frank, 152n8
Nonnus, 10
Noorda, S., 265, 267–269
Noort, E., 216n36
Noth, Martin, 247
Noy, David, 233–234
Nubia, 4, 28, 50, 135–147
Nunn, J.F., 268n36

Oates, John F., 29n7, 184n10
Oenanthe 380, 382, 384
Ogden, Daniel, 1, 6, 95n24, 107, 292, 295, 297n29, 355n8, 356n15, 357n22, 358n27, 359n31, 361–362, 364n58, 366n64, 368–372, 379n133, 380–384
Oliver, Graham J., 76n47
Olympiads, 366
Olympus, 18, 224, 291
Olympic crown, 62
O'Neil, James L., 3, 71n30, 88n98
Onesicritus, 11
opson, 105, 112
Orel, Vladimir E., 128
Oren, E., 173, 176–177
Orlinsky, H.M., 197
Orth, Wolfgang, 229–231
Osborne, Michael J., 47n35, 69–70, 86n90
Osiris, 120, 122, 125–126, 129, 131–133, 243, 280, 282, 293, 297, 305, 313–350, 389–392, 395, 404, 407
Osorapis, *see* Serapis
Otto, Eberhard, 277n9, 247n173, 362n45, 393n34
Oxyrhynchite nome, 30, 185
oinochoai, 59

Pan, 143n43, 291
panegyric, 19, 137
Pamphylia, 28n4, 40, 43n13, 46–48, 52, 64, 396
Pape, W., 269n87
Paphos, , 42–44, 58n86, 60
Parke, H.W., 103–104, 111
Parker, Holt T., 259n10
parrhesia, 22
Parthenius, 10
Passoni Dell'Acqua, Anna, 248n2
pastophorai, 393
pax, , 125
Patroclos, 48, 61, 63, 65, 71–87
patronage, 3, 9–24, 150
Pédech, P., 39n3, 50n49
Peithidemos, 66, 68–76, 79–81
Pelikan, Jaroslav, 209–211, 218, 223n51
Pelletier, André, 48n43
Per-Kerehet, 283
Perdiccas, 140, 372
Peremans, W., 135, 354, 361n45
Pérez Die, M.C., 183
Pergamon, 16, 105–108
periodization, 250

Peripatetic school, 137, 212, 231
Persaios of Kition, 1
Peshitta, 220
Pestman, P.W., 43n16, 184n9, 188n18, 327n91, 403n95, 405n105
Peteërmotis, 406
Peters, J.P., 173–178
Petrakos, B.C., 369n89
Peust, Carsten, 286n38
Pfeiffer, R., 51n57, 151
Pfeiffer, Stefan, 6, 287n39, 288n42, 401n85
Pharos, 60, 194
Phemennas, 404
Philae, 139, 146, 297, 340
Philaenis, 373–375
Philetas, 10
philia, 55, 110
Philip of Macedon, 78, 103, 369
Philip II, 40n5, 93n15
Philip V, 41
Philo of Alexandria 213, 215, 219, 222
Philo, the Epic poet, 212
Philokles, king of Sidon, 60
philomousos, 21
Philonides of Thebes, 1
Philotera, 142, 233
Phoenicia, 28, 42–43, 46, 52, 64, 121, 371
phrouroi, 104
Picard, C., 122
Piccirilli, Luigi, 159n34
Piérart, M., 57n82, 61n97, 72–73
Pietsch, Christian, 150n5
pigs, 81
Pindar, 19, 21–22, 119
Piper, Linda J., 89n100
pirates, 76
Pithom stela, 5, 50n49, 68, 140n28, 142, 153, 278, 280, 283, 286
Plango of Miletus, 374
Plangon, 373–375
plasma, , 248
Plataia, 72–74
Platea, 57
Plato 208–215, 217–218, 223–224
Pliny, 11, 137, 363–364, 370
Pluto, 392–393, 407
poikilia, 194, 238–239
Pokorny, Julius, 127, 131n61
Polybius 39–42, 44, 356–357, 380, 383
Pomeroy, Sarah B., 114, 271n46, 257n21, 258n29, 268, 380
Posidippus, 58, 62, 355, 362, 365n62, 367, 373–375
Potheine, 357
Pouilloux, J., 57n83
Prakken, Donald W., 143n43
Praxidikai, 57
Préaux, Claire, 45n26, 143n39, 294n12, 295n18
Preisendanz, Karl, 188n19
Press, Gerald A., 213n28
Pretagostini, Roberto, 381n150
Priapus, 57
Price, S.R.F., 155n24
Priene, 393
priest, 57n83, 58, 63, 69, 127, 134, 176, 193–194, 262, 307–311, 337, 340, 377, 394, 396, 398–399, 404–406
priestly synods, 5, 287
Pritchard, James B., 236n25
Pritchett, W. Kendrick, 69–70, 110, 112
Proclus, 10, 213n27
Prophecy of the Lamb 282
prophet, 234, 251, 261–263
prophetic collection, 251
Proxenos, 57n83, 58n86, 103, 110
Pseudo-Hecataeus, 235, 239
Ptah, 122, 307–308, 321, 329–330, 398, 391, 399
Ptolemaic thalassocracy, 40, 60
Ptolemaieia, 18, 19, 24, 27, 140n28, 155–156, 189
Ptolemais of the Hunts (=Ptolemais Theron), 137, 142–144, 282
Ptolemy I, Soter, 2, 11–12, 19, 42–44, 45n25, 46n29, 54–56, 58, 63, 66, 71, 87, 91–95, 114, 119, 134, 153, 156, 171–172, 249, 285, 353–356,

361, 388–391, 393–394n46, 398, 400, 402, 407
Ptolemy II, Philadelphus
and gout, ix, 154
his menagerie, ix, 178
basileia, 50
love of literature, 12
fiscal year, 30
display of luxury, 41
and league of Islanders, 43, 56
submissiveness, 45
control of Caria, 46
victory over Antigonos, 48n43
and Delos, 48n43
and Isis cult, 51n52
receiving tribute of Asia, 53
and Miletus, 55
filial piety, 56
and Homonoia, 56
and Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Kypris, 58
and Cilicia, , 59
coinage, 75, 154n17, 171–172
and Macedon, 82
and Pyrrhus, 91–102
and Carthage, 98
misthodotes, 103
and Nubia, 135–147
and Jewish slaves, 195
and Septuagint, 207–232, 237–246, 248–249
imagined empire, 52
philanthropia, 54
names the dynasty, 55, 61
founding cult, 298–299
effectiveness as king, 87
benefactor, 67, 87–88
as Moses, 242–246
as Pharaoh, , 275
purely hieroglyphic texts, 275–289
and sacred animals, 279
new achievements, 283
throne-name, 284
brother loving, 291
courtesans, 353–386
marriage to Arsinoe, 120, 276–277, 282, 291–300
ruler cult, 276, 387–408
Ptolemy III, Euergetes, 12, 41, 48, 53n64, 55, 57n83, 67, 88, 135, 149, 171–172, 233n5, 275, 308, 376, 379, 382, 395, 400–401, 408
Ptolemy IV, Philopator, 12, 62, 155n21, 172, 203, 232n78, 234, 251n3, 286, 300, 361–362, 368, 380, 401, 408n111
Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, 172, 382–383
Ptolemy VI, Philometor, 383–384
Ptolemy VII Neos Philopator 383
Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II Physcon, 12, 171–172, 356–357, 384–385
Ptolemy IX Philometor II Lathyrus 384
Ptolemy Andromachou 365, 376–379
Ptolemy Apion 384
Ptolemy C/Kerauno/us,, 97, 291
Ptolemy of Ephesus, 376, 378–379
Ptolemy Eupator, 383
Ptolemy of Alorus, 292
Ptolemy of Megalopolis, 357
Ptolemy of Telmessus, 379
Ptolemy the Son (Nios), 379
Ptolemy, son of Lysimachus 379
Punic Wars, 98, 100, 155
Pury, A. de, 249
Pyrrhus of Epirus, 3, 91–102, 356, 363
Pythagoreans, 213–214

Qos, 176
Quack, Joachim Friedrich, x, 5, 282n27, 286n38, 288n44, 306n10, 308n16, 314n35, 321n61, 322–323, 325n81, 326–327, 329, 335n129, 338n145, 339n151, 390n15
Quaegebeur, Jan, 276n4, 297–300, 347n172, 399n69, 400n74
Quintus of Smyrna, 10

Raphia, 53n64, 119, 145–146, 286
Ravazzolo, C., 376, 379
Ray, J.D., 34n31, 390n17

Re, 151, 278, 315, 324, 332, 340–342
Red Sea, 3, 27–28, 40, 50, 137, 141–144, 189, 236, 282, 370
Reden, Sitta von, 29n6
Redford, Donald B., 136n4, 259n8, 285n31
Redmount, Carol A., 142n37
Reger, Gary, 47n95, 48n43, 49n45
Regev, D., 179
Rhadopis, 348, 350
Rhakotis, 390n17, 400
Rhianus, 10
Rhodes, 1, 10, 19, 43, 57n83, 103, 105, 150
Rhodes, P.J., 103
Rice, E.E., 19n13, 56n79, 140n28, 145n51, 156n25
riff, 5, 244–246
Ritner, Robert K., 136n8, 259n8, 270n42, 303n1, 306n11, 308n16, 312n28, 316n45, 319n54, 327n92, 332n117, 334n123, 336n132, 338, 343n164, 344n168, 346n169, 351
Ritual of Overthrowing Seth, 317n49, 325
Robert, Jeanne et Louis, 46n31
Robert, Louis, 59
Roberts, C.H., 48n43
Robertson, Noel, 101n73
Robins, Gay, 294n13, 297–298
Roeder, Günther, 140n28, 142n38, 276n5, 278n15, 280n18, 281n24, 282, 283n29
Roll, Israel, 178
Rome, 22, 40, 63, 93n15, 96–100, 155, 259–260, 283, 300, 400
Römer, Thomas C., 258n4
Rösel, Martin, 209–114, 247
Rostovtzeff, Mikhail Ivanovich, 39, 43n18
Rostowzew, M., 143n42
Rostropowicz, Joanna, 150n5, 156n28
Roullet, Anne, 404n99
Roux, G., 49n45
Rowlandson, Jane, 259n8, 271n46, 406n107
Rübsam, Winfried J.R., 405n101
Runia, David T., 210n15, 211n20, 212n24, 213n27, 218n42, 222n48, 224n43
Rydstrom, K.T., 124n24
Ryholt, Kim, 308n16, 329n98, 341n160

Sackett, L.H., 77n53
sacred animals, 279, 286
Sais, 5, 53, 122, 283–285, 287–288
Salmenkivi, Erja, 4, 183n4, 184n10, 185n11, 188n20
salt-tax, *see halikê*
Samaritan Pentateuch, 220
Sambin, C., 275n3
Samos, 44, 46, 48, 49n45, 52, 54n69, 58n86, 59–64, 153
Samothrace, 41, 49, 54n69
Samuel, Alan E., 45n26, 95n36, 153n10, 186n14
Sanders, Jack T., 265n28
sarcophagus, 125, 128
Satrape stele, 53n64, 153
Savalli-Lestrade, Ivana, 104
Schalles, Hans-Joachim, 105
Schaps, D.M., 100n61
Scheer, Tanja S., 393n40
Schipper, Bernd U., 281n25
Schmid, K., 250, 251n4
Schmidt, Stefan, 389n11, 392n30
Schmitt, A., 209n7, 294n14
Schmitt, Hatto H., 210n13, 211n16, 229n65
Schneider, K., 370n87
Schott, Siegried, 317n49
Schroer, Silvia, 271n46
Schulz, Regine, 314n35, 323n73, 335n129
Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth, 266n33
Scullard, H.H., 141n32, 146n59, 189
sed festival, 288
Seibert, J., 43n13, 46n29, 55n73, 91n1, 94n27
Seibert, Peter, 278n16
Seiler, Florian, 49n45

Sekhmet, 270
Sekunda, Nick, 52n61
Seleucus I Nikator, 93–96, 106, 229n62, 359
Seleukos II, 56n77
Selqet, 270
Serapeum, 13, 299, 400n78, 401n81, 406n108
Serapis, 6, 129, 132, 134, 388–408
Sethe, Kurt, 137n1, 153, 275, 278n15, 281n24, 282, 330n103, 369n68, 400n74
Seybold, Klaus, 257
sexuality, 5, 208, 213–215, 219–228, 310, 312, 319–320, 326, 329–334, 336–342, 348, 355–357, 362, 374–376, 381–382
Shatby, 177
Shaw, Brent D., 294, 301n41
Shaw, Ian, 294
Shear, T. Leslie Jr., 19n11, 48n40, 60n95
Shipley, Graham, 46n30, 47n34, 49n45, 105–106, 153n11
Shipwrecked Sailor, 309, 311, 344–345
Shklovskii, Victor, 303n2
Sidebotham, Steven E., 143n40
Sidon, 60, 171, 173, 176, 178
Sicily, 92, 97–102
Siegert, Folker, 212n23, 229–231
Silver Shields, 106, 112
Silverman, D.P., 151n6
Simonides, 21–22, 137
Simpson, R.S., 120n4
Simpson, W.K. 135n8, 304n3, 305n6, 311n23, 315n40
Sinope, 243, 393
Siwa, 27
Sjöberg, N., 280n18
Skeat, T.C., 406–407
slaves, 43n17, 108, 136, 195, 227, 236, 239–244, 271, 370
Smith, Harry S., 308n16, 313n34, 331n112, 332n114
Smith, Mark, 339–342
Snaith, John G., 266n27
Snodgrass, A.M., 122n14
Sollamo, Raija, 235n16, 239
Solon 214
Sosin, Joshua D., 59n91, 61n97
Sostratos of Cnidus, 60
Sotades, 291–292, 365n63, 370–373, 375, 381, 399
Soter, *see* Ptolemy I
soteria, , 61
Soteres, 58n86, 298
Sounion promontory, 61
Sparta, ix, 3, 47, 63, 65–69, 73–75, 79, 81–89, 100, 112, 153, 293, 364, 367
Spawforth, Antony, 68n10
Speusippus, 214
Stadler, Martin, 319n54
Stambaugh, J.E., 332n116, 391n23, 392n26, 396n52
Steinberg, A., 75n42
Stephanus of Byzantium, 11
Stephens, Susan A., 53, 120n3, 121–123, 150
Sterling, Gregory E., 212n26, 229n64, 230n68
Sternberg, Heike, 313n33, 314n36, 315n38, 333n120, 337n139
Stolbova, Olga V., 128
stolistai, 393
Strabo, 11, 137, 144, 147, 229, 380
Straton of Lampsacus, 231
Stratonice, courtesan of Philadelphus, 357–359
Stratonice, daughter of Demetrius, Poliorcetes, 359–360
statues, 43–44, 48n43, 49n45, 53, 55–63, 132, 174, 178, 243, 277, 279, 281, 285, 297, 299, 316, 323, 337, 341n160, 357, 359, 367, 381, 387, 392–394, 401–402
Story of Sinuhe, 305, 311, 344n168
Stratton, B.J., 216n37
Strauss, B., 111
Stroud, R.S., 79, 113
Suda, 51, 58, 148, 365n63, 369, 372
Suhr, Claudia, 305n5
Sundberg, A.C. Jr, 255
swnw, 262

Swiderek, A., 390n13
symmachia, 55
symposion, 11, 13, 18–24, 194, 237, 244, 358–359, 361
Synesius, 10
synodal decrees, 274, 287
Syracuse, 97, 110
Syria, 3, 28, 39, 40, 42–43, 52, 94, 141, 145, 153, 264, 312, 325
Syrian wars, 28, 34, 37, 46, 48–49, 53, 63–64, 84–85, 101–102, 106, 141–142, 145, 153, 176, 281, 299
syssitia, , 13

Tabubue, 310, 332–350
Tait, William J., 308n16, 350n186, 405
Takács, Gábor, 125n29
Talbert, R.J.A., 94n28
Tale of Isis and Re, 315
Tale of Isis, the Rich Woman, and the Marsh Woman, 315
Tale of the Doomed Prince, 312
Tale of Two Brothers, 311, 341
Tamar, 260
Tarentum, 92, 96–99
Tarn, W.W., ix, 1–3, 6, 39, 81, 83, 95, 99–100
Tataki, Argyro B., 269n87
Tawe, 270
Taylor, A.E., 213, 223n52, 224n59
taxes, 43n17, 45, 54–56, 88, 114–115, 163, 187
  personal tax, 29
  poll-tax, 32
  salt-tax (*halikê*) 3, 31–32, 37–38
  yoke-tax, 31
  tax concessions, 32–33, 38
  tax of a sixth (*hektê*), 32
  registers, 35
  apomoira, 3, 114, 300
  bread tax, 278
  exemption, 106, 109, 114, 278, 285
  caravan tax, 282
Tcherikover, Victor A., 235n7
Tebtynis, 184–185, 329–330
Telmessos, 46, 63, 67, 88
Thais, 353–356
Thebes, 1, 62, 79, 93n15, 112, 121, 143, 146, 231n73, 309
Theocritus, 10, 17–21, 28, 44–45, 49–53, 56, 95n37, 137, 139, 150, 152–154, 291–292, 356, 363–365, 381
Theodectos, 249
Theoi Soteres, 54, 298
Theophrastus, 231, 363–364
Theophrastus of Eresus, 267
Theopompos, 249
Thera, 47, 54n69, 57, 59, 63, 401, 403–404, 407–408
Thiel, J.H., 98n49
Thierault, Gaëtan, 57n82
Thierfelder, H., 294n12, 301n41
Thiers, Christophe, 53n65, 275n3, 280n18, 283–284
Thiersch, H., 173–179
Thiel, J.H., 98n49
Thiérault, Gaëtan, 57n82
Thomas, J.D., 34n30
Thompson, Dorothy Burr, 59n89, 400n75, 364n59
Thompson, Dorothy J., 19n13, 29n6, 30, 32–33, 36, 38n40, 54n71, 56n80, 61n94, 121, 140n28, 183n3, 184n8, 187, 189n25, 298n34, 389, 396
Thompson, Herbert, 316n45
Thompson, T.L., 248
Thot, 276, 278, 303, 306, 309, 317, 320, 324, 343
  see also Magic Book
Thrace, 40–41, 49, 129, 291
Thurneysen, Rudolf, 128n41
Timotheus the Athenian, 394
Timotheus the Eumolpid, 129, 134
Timon of Phlious, 1, 13
Thyonikos, 28
Timosthenes, admiral, 51, 137
Tjeku, 280–283
Tkaczow, B., 400n76
Tlepolemus, 383
Tod, M.N., 110, 390n17

tombs, 4, 162n44, 170, 173–180, 277, 309–310, 317, 333–334, 336, 347, 359, 363, 365, 367
Tondriau, J., 399n79
Török, László, 139n23, 144n48
Torrey, Charles C., 240n46
Tosuches, 137
Tov, Emanuel, 207n1, 254
Tracy, Sterling, 234
Tréheux, J., 357n24
Trible, Phyllis, 216n36
Triumph of Horus 317–319, 336
Trogodytes, 143n43, 144
Trojan War, 122, 150
Troxell, H.A., 67n8
Troy, Lana, 341n159
Troyer, Kristin de, 206
Trundle, Matthew F., 3, 103, 108, 110–112
Tryphiodorus, 10
Tunny, Jennifer Ann, 46n32, 154n18, 376n121, 379n133
Tuplin, C.J., 104, 113
Turner, E.G., 28, 295
Thutmosis II, 296
Thutmosis III, 285
Tyre, 171, 365, 369n82, 371–372

Uebel, Fritz, 189n24
Ulrich, E., 253n6

Van Bremen, Riet, 46n31
Vanderlip, Vera F., 325n85
Vanderpool, E., 75n42
Vandier, Jacques, 337n139
Vandorpe, Katelijn, 32n20, 34, 188, 397n57
Van Effenterre, H., 44n23
Varucha-Christodoulopoulou, Eirene, 75n43
Vassilika, Eleni, 375n3
Veisse, Anne-Emmanuelle, 387n1, 146n54
Veken, G. van der, 57n83, 58n86, 61n97
Veltri, Giuseppe, 207n1, 231n78, 248n2
Verhoogt, Arthur M.F.W., 35n32, 184n9
Vérilhac, Anne-Marie, , 292n8, 293, 301n41
Vernus, Pascal, 280n17
Vial, Claude, 292n8, 293, 301n41
Vian, Francis, 150n4, 158, 160, 164, 165n55, 166
Vidman, Ladislav, 390n14, 393n32, 402n86
Vinogradov, Y.G., 51n52
Vinson, Steve, 6
Virgilio, Biagio, 22n17, 105
Vittmann, Günter, 347n174
Vleeming, S.P., 390n17, 391n25
Volokhine, Youri, *see* Borgeaud
Vranopoulos, Epaminondas A., 189n27
Vulgate, 220
Vycichl, Werner, 126n34, 127

Wace, A.J.B., 67n7
Wacholder, B.Z., 151n3
Wainwright, Elaine M., 5–6, 259n7, 260n14
Walbank, F.W., 46n28, 47n35, 48n43, 53n64, 57n83, 62n104, 80n63, 81n69, 82n70, 93n12, 94n27, 95n34, 100n56, 382n157, 384n165
Walker, Susan, 337n137
Wallace, Howard, 222n49
Walter, N., 200–203
Wasserstein, David J., 248n2
Watson, F., 216n37
Watterson, Barbara, 259n8, 271
Weber, G., 18
Wedrich, Willemina, 143n40
Wees, Hans van, 107, 110, 112
Weinreich, Otto, 390n14
Welles, C. Bradford, 55n73, 80n64
Wells, Louise, 257n2
Welsby, Derek A., 144n48
Wenamun, 305, 312–313, 344
Wente, Edward, 305n8, 311n26, 312n29, 313n32, 315n39, 337n133

Westermann, William Linn, 239, 365n63
Wevers, John William, 196, 221
Wheatley, P.V., xi, 355n8, 379n137
Wilcken, Ulrich, 184, 188, 390, 393, 404n97, 405, 406n106
Wildung, D., 401n84
Will, Edouard, 43n13, 44n23, 46n28, 47n35, 48n42, 135
Williams, M.F., 161n41, 163n49
Wills, Lawrence M., 237, 245
Wilson, Penelope, 329n97
Winkler, John J., 348n180
Winnicki, J.K., 281n21, 282n26
Winston, D., 202n10
Winter, Erich, 146n54, 281n22
Wiseman, J.R., 79n60
Wörrle, Michael, 43n13, 46n32, 67n5, 88n97

Yoyotte, J., 60n94

Xenocrates, 214
Xerxes, 66, 74

Žabkar, Louis V., 322n64
Zanker, G., 21
Zauzich, Karl-Theodor, 34n29, 308n16
Zenodotus, 10
Zeus, 18–19, 57, 73, 120, 122, 134, 151–152, 157–165, 168, 193, 198–199, 224, 291, 294, 367, 381, 388, 390, 392, 399, 407
Zeyl, Donald J., 213n27, 214n29, 227n61
Ziegler, Christiane, 294n14, 297n31
Ziegler, Konrat, 15–16
Zitterkopf, Ronald E., 143n40
Zuntz, G., 237
Zoilos, 31, 396–398, 403, 406, 408

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

Aelian

Historia animalium

1.6	364
5.2	364
5.29	364
8.11	364
11.4	81
16.36	81

Varia historia

1.26	362n52
3.17	231n77
9.39	364n57
12.17	355n8
13.8–9	355n8

Agatharchides

On the Erythraean Sea

F8 n.1	147n63
F12–13	138
F57	144n47
F85a–b	143n43
*FGrHist*86F19	137n18

Apollodoros

FGrHist 244F44	86n86
3.14.7	129
3.15.4	129

Apollonius Rhodius

Argonautica

1.300	161n39
1.338–340	157
1.802	157n29
1.858–860	149n1
1.966–967	149n1
2.11–18	149n2
2.17	165
2.123–129	164n50
2.302–303	149n1
2.760–761	149n1
2.987–988	165
2.1202–1203	161n40
3.15	161
3.217–237	163
3.270–274	161
3.337	157n29
3.377–380	161
3.381	161
3.420–421	162
3.448	162
3.576–605	161
3.587–588	161
3.1105–1107	161
3.1225–1234	163
4.95–96	160
4.234–235	162
4.338–340	159
4.341–347	47, 159, 165–166
4.376–378	159
4.377–378	160
4.397	159
4.399	159n35
4.404–404	149n2
4.445–447	164
4.485–489	164
4.514–521	162n44
4.526–528	149n2
4.645–648	149n2
4.650–653	150
4.982–986	158n33
4.986–991	158n33
4.991–992	158
4.994–995	149n1
4.994–1000	158
4–1010	164n52
4.1042–1044	160, 165
4.1100	158
4.1102	162
4.1104–1105	164

4.1123 158
4.1175–1176 164n51
4.1176–1181 166
4.1179 165
4.1182–1200 166–167
4.1201–1210 167
4.1205 157n29, 165
4.1211–1216 162n44
6.120–121 158
8.575–576 158n31
9.175–176 158n31
13.201–202 158n31

Appian

Preface
10 52, 54, 145, 155

Sicilica
1 98n51, 100

Apuleius

Metamorphoses
11 321
11.13 132
11.27 127

Aratus

Phaenonema
107 167

Aristeas to Philocrates
15 246n74
21–27 239
30 248
31 249
62–72 238
83–171 239
96–99 238
121–122 194, 213n26, 242
180 48n43
294 241n49
310 229
312–316 231n78, 249

Aristophanes

Acharnians
181 377n127

Frogs
367 133

Schol. Aristophanes

Thesmophoriazusae 380, 140

Aristotle

Politics
1.1268a14 113

Arrian

Anabasis
3.1.3–4 389n8
3.18.11 354n3
3.21 115
6.10.1 112

Asclepiades

Palatine Anthology
5.202–203 373
5.210 358

Athenaeus

Deipnosophistae
1.22d 13
4.141 67n9
5.46 209E 84
5.196a–203b 27n1
5.201a 50n48
12.536e 27n2
86f 372n104
101e 355n8
176c 363
197d–e 156n25
198c 56n79
201d 57
203a 52n61
209e 47n39

251c 384n164
425e 357n23
415ab 362
558b 374–375
567ef 374n116
576de 354
576ef 357, 365n63, 369, 380n140
577c 379
583ab 361
589e 292n9
593ab 376n123
594b–d 374n116
596e 372, 395n63
620f 292
621a 372n109, 381n149

Anaxilas

F22 375n119

Callimachus

F75 381n150
Epithalamion
F392 291n3
Hymn
1.80–86 151
5.2 374n115
171–185 95n37

Callixeinus

On Alexandria
FGrHist 627F2.32 140n28, 145n51

Cicero

Pro Rabirio Postumo
9.23 229

Clement of Alexandria

Protrepticus 126
2.13 130
2.18 127
4.42 365n63, 367, 369
4.48 255n8
Stromateis
2.100.3 200

Coffin Texts 322
Spell 49 331
Spell 208 133

Demetrius the chronographer 203, 232n78, 251

Demosthenes

4.28 112
50.10–12 111–112

Diodorus Siculus

1.27.1–2 293
1.28.4–6 122
1.29.4 129
1.37.5 137n18
1.84.8 389
3.6 144n48
16.30.2 111
17.7.2 110
17.27 115
29.1 110
33.13 384
40.3 249

Diogenes Laertius

5.37 231
5.75–83 229
5.76 355n8
5.78–79 156

Eupolemus

F2.1–2 251

Euripides

Andromache
173 292

Eusebius

Chronicles
1.207 365–369
Praeparatio evangelica
8.10 200–201
12.1 201
13.12 201

Eustathius

1224.50 361

Florus

Epitome
1.18.1–28 92n8
1.18.8 97n44

First Setne
3.6–7 332
3.8 327n92
3.25–26 344n164
4.3 346n170
4.8–9 327
4.17–19 306
4.28 336
4.39 338n146

Frontinus

Stratagems
2.2.1 92n8, 97n45
2.3.21 92n8, 97n45
2.4.9 92n8
2.4.13 92n8, 97n44
2.6.9–10 92n8
3.6.3 92n8
4.1.3–14 92n8
4.4.2 92n8

Glorification Ritual for Osiris
319–320, 333

Herondas

Mimiambus
1 21

Herodotus

Histories
1.149.1 108
2.49 130n52
2.50 134
2.60 337
2.141 308n16
2.158 50n49
2.171 123
3.97.1–2 140n29, 163n47
4.181–185 136n3
9.34 130n50

Hesiod

Theogony
84–87 165
96 151

Homer

Iliad
2.339 160n38
3 110
9.160 162
18.356 381
18.491–508 168
22.148–152 163n48
22.261 161n39
Odyssey
5.35 157
7.170 131n62
7.231 158
9.367 131n62
11.291–294 129n49
15.225–226 129n49

Homeric Hymn to Demeter
151–155 129n44
275–281 132n68

Instructions of Onchsheshonqy
11.7 327

Isocrates
14.33 110

Jerome/Hieronymus
In Danielem
11.6a 382
11.7–8 153
11.13–14 380

John of Antioch
FHG iv p. 558 F4 380

Justin
12.2.12 97
15.12 355
16.2.2–3 95
16.3.1–2 96
17.2.11 91
17.2.13 100
17.2.14–15 92, 97–99
18.1.1–11 96
18.2.1–5 98
18.2.9 100
25.1.1 99
25.3.1 97, 99, 100
25.3.5–8 100
25.4.6–5.2 100
25.5.4–6 97
26.2 47n35, 65, 80–82
26.2.1–9 101n74
26.3.2–8 382
30.1–2 381
30.2.3 384
39.5.2 384–385

Josephus
Against Apion
1.166–167 231n77
2.5 384
2.50–52 235
2.53–54 235
Jewish Antiquities
Preface 2 250
12.11–119 230
13.4 146
13.68 234n9
14.117 229
Vita
185 259

Longinus
33 10

Lucian
De historia conscribenda
62 60
Demonax
34 130

Schol. Lucian
Icaromenippus
15 359n34
Livy 34.10

Maronea Isis Hymn
l.17 333–334

Memnon of Heraclea
FGrHist 434F8.7 293

Memphite Theology 319
20–22 330
62 328
62–64 330

Myth of the Eye of the Sun
3.24 319n53
5.10 319n53
5.21 319n53

Nepos

Cimon
1.2 292n9

Ovid

Metamorphoses
21.633–674 132

Pausanias

Description of Greece
1.1.1 47n35, 61.99, 71, 101n73
1.2.4 131n59
1.6.8 94, 356n12
1.7.1 43n19, 45, 293
1.7.2 95n37
1.7.3 65
1.8.6 55n72
1.9.8 100n59
1.10.2 96n38
1.11.5 94
1.12.1 96n40
1.12.3 97n45
1.12.5–13.1 92n10, 97n47
1.13.1–2 97n45, 99n55, 100
1.13.4–6 100
1.13.7–8 100
1.21.7 108
1.26.1 76
1.26.3 71, 73
1.36.4 65
1.38.2 129
1.43.5 130n56
3.6.3 100
3.6.4–6 47n35, 65, 75–76, 78–79, 84
4.29.6 100
5.8.11 365n63, 366, 368n78, 368n82
6.16.3 46n31
6.17.3 62n105
7.3 47n35

Pherekydes

F24 130n50

Philo Judaeus

De Fuga et Inventione
68–70 218n42
De Opificio Mundi
15–16 210n15
72–75 222
75 218n42
152 225n57
De Specialibus Legibus
3.23–25 293
De Vita Moysis
2.25–44 230n69
Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim
1.28 219–220

Phylarchus

FGrHist 81F1 85
FGrHist 81F12 356n8
FGrHist 81F44 67n9

Phlegon of Tralles

Olympic chronology
257a F6 365–368

Plato

Laws
838 a–c 292
904E4 214n31
Republic
5.455D2 223n52
9.588C7 225n55
Symposium
189C–93D 214, 224

Timaeus
18C–E 225–226
21E–22C 122n13
22–25 214n29
27C–29D 211
29A 211
29E 217
30B 217
31B 211n17
34B 217
37C 209
33B 209
38B 209
39E 217
40A 217
41C 218
41E 227
43C 211n17
38–57 213n27
40A 209
41BC 215
41D 209, 211, 218
41E 223
42A 218, 223
42B 224
42E 209, 211
44D 218
52D–E 227
69A 209
69E–70A 227
70E 225n55
77A 209
87C 211
91A 209, 211, 214, 224
91B 225n56
91C 224–225
91D 223–225
92C 211

Pliny the Elder

Natural History
6.58 50n51
6.180 142n35
10.51 363–364
37.32 370n92

Plutarch

Agesilaus
31 111
Agis et Cleomenes
3.4 79
3.5 83
33 364n164, 380n140
Alexander
38 354n3
71 114
Cimon
4.6–8 292n9
15.4 292n9
De exilio
17 129n45
De Iside et Osiride = Isis and Osiris
12 329n95
28 243n55, 393n40
37 333n122
39 126n34
Demetrius
10 355n8
16 355
23–27 355n8
25.2 93n16
25.7–8 58
30–32 93, 356n13
33.7 95n33
41.3 91n3
44 95
Dion
31 110
Moralia
11a 292, 381n149
183c–d 47n39, 84n82
292e 369n88
397a 354n57
545b 47n39, 84
735d 380n140, 384n164
736f 381n146
753ef 365n63, 367, 369–370, 374n1
851f 76
972f 364

Pyrrhus
2–3 98n48
3.4–5 91n3
4.1 93n17
4.3–5.1 91n2, 94
4.4 93n22, 356n14
5.1 91n3
6.2–4 91n3
8 95n35
9.1 95n29
10.4–5 95n29
11.1–6 95n32
12.1–7 96n38
17–26 97
26 100n57
27–34 100n57

Polybius
1.2 40n5
1.6–7–7.12 92n8
3.25 89n49
5.34.2–9 39n3, 40n5, 42n9
5.79.2 145n52
5.82.7 145n52
5.84.3–7 145n53
14.11 380n140, 382n157, 384n164
14.11.1 357n23
14.11.2 356–357
15.18.8 93n15
15.25–33 380n140, 383, 384n164
18.41.7–8 105
21.32.2 41n5
27.9 62n104

Polyaenus
4.6.3 81

Porphyry
FGrHist 260F42 145
FGrHist 260F43 153

Posidippus
AB 39, 116, 119 58
F3 362
Milan 71–88 355, 362, 367
PA 5.202 373–374

Pyramid Text Utterance 365

Seneca
Apocolocyntosis
8.3 293

Sextus Empiricus
Pyrrhon
1.152 293
3.205 293
3.234 293

Songs of Isis and Nephthys
1.14–15 328
2.6 329
3.6 329
3.7–8 326
5.24–6.1 329
6.2 328
14.28 328
15.1 331

Strabo
6.3.4 97n41
6.22 108
8.6.18 100n61
8.7.1 96n40
9.1.21 (C395) 71
9.3.10 52n54
16.4.5 (C769) 61n100, 142n36
16.4.7 (C770) 144n45
16.4.8 (470) 137n12
16.4.9 61
17.1.2 137n15
17.1.5 (C789) 39n3, 147n60
17.1.6 60
17.1.25 50n49

17.789 154
C795 380

Simonides the Younger

FrGrHist 666T 137

Song of Isis and Nephthys
2.6 329
3.6 329
3.7–12 326
5.24–6.1 329

Tacitus

Histories
4.83–84 243n54, 393n40

Theocritus

Epigram
23 (PA 7.262) 363
Idyll
4.31 363
14 20, 49
14.59 28, 49
14.61 154
15.126–128 52
16 21
17 3, 17, 19, 137n17, 137
17.86–87 45n24, 50, 52, 137n17, 139
17.98–101 95
17.112–114 18
17.121–127 56, 152
17.128 291n3
17.131–134 381n147
112–114 18

Schol. Theocritus

4.31 363

Theophrastus

F567b 364
F567c 363–364

Timosthenes

On Harbours
PP 5.13794 137

Trogus

Prologue to book 26 79–80
30 380

Thucydides

5.47 110

Xenophon

Anabasis
1.2.11–12 107
1.4.8 114
1.4.13 112
1.5.5–6 112
3.1.4 103, 110
5.6.36 163n46
6.2.4 112
7.3.20 110
Hellenica
6.1.6 112–113

Bible

Genesis
1–11 209
1–3 207–232, 226
1–2 202, 208
1.1–2.4 208
1 201n9, 202
1.1–5 210n15
1.1–2 210
1.6–8 209
1.6 211
1.14–19 209
1.20–25 209

1.25 211
1.26–28 209, 215, 218–219, 228
1.27 207n1, 208, 215–217, 222n48, 223
1.28 226
2.3 208–209
2.4 209
2.5–24 208
2.7–25 217
2.7 209, 216, 221
2.8 209
2.9 209, 212
2.16 216
2.17 223
2.18–25 208–209, 219, 222, 225, 228
2.19 209, 212
2.20–25 219–220, 225
3.7–8 222
3.13 223
3.16–19 221–222
3.22 218
4.7 221n47
5.1–3 216–217
5.1 216
20.17 257n2
24.7 245n65
35.17 258
38.28 258

Exodus
1.8–21 258
14.13 236n20
15.20–21 262
15.23–26 267
15.26 257
17.14–16 245n71
22.18 260
24.3–7 195
24.10–12 241
25 238
28—29 238

Numbers
12.13 257n2

Deuteronomy
17.16 236n19
18.9–14 260
28.68 236n20
32.39 257

Joshua 247, 250
24 251n4

Judges 250
4.4 251, 262
6.7 251
21 253

Ruth 250, 253–254

1 Samuel
4.20 258
15.8–9 245n69
28.3–7 260–261

2 Samuel
13 260
14.2 261
20.16 261

2 Kingdoms
7.8 255n8
7.14 255n8
22.50 255n8

1 Kings
13.1–6 261
17.17–24 261

3 Kingdoms
19.10–18 255n8

2 Kings
4.8–37 260–261
5.1–19 261
22.14–20 262

2 Chronicles 250
16.12 263

Ezra 241
6–7 240

Nehemiah 241
6.14 262
10.2–28 240n46

Esther 236, 246, 250–252
2.5 245n68
3.1 245n69
7.9–8.2 245n70

Job
5.18 257n2
28.25–27 210n9

Psalms
2.7 255n8
27.50 255n8

Proverbs 252
1–9 266n32
2.11 204
2.17 204
8 245
8.22 202–203, 245n71
8.22–26 210n9
9 204
9.10 204
13 204
13.15 204
24 245
28.4 199, 204
24–31 203
24 245
30–31 203

Song of Solomon
7.11 221

Isaiah
19.22 257n2
31.1 236n22
38.21 262
57.18 257n2

Jeremiah
8.22 262, 263n21
17.14 262
30.17 262
33.6 262
42.13–17 236n23
44.15–30 260

Ezekiel
13.17–23 260
17.14 236n24
47.12 263

Tobit 236, 245–246
2.10 263
5.3–8 245n66

Ecclesiasticus (=Sirach)
1.19 266
7.24–25 269
7.35 265n28
10.10 265n28
18.19 266n32
22.3–5 269
23.22–26 269
24.3 245n71
25.16–26.18 269
26.10–12 269
36.26–31 269
38.1–15 257–273
38.1–3 265
38.6–8 267
38.9–15 268
42.9–14 269
44–49 251

1 Maccabees
1.14–15 204n11

2 Maccabees
1.1–2.18 236n18
1.10 200n7

3 Maccabees 234
5.12 292n6
7.7 234n8

1 Esdras
3.1–4.42 241n48

Romans
13.3–4 255n8
15.9 255n8

1 Corinthians
11 219

2 Corinthians
6.8 255n8
11.2–3 223

Hebrews
1.5 255n8

Dead Sea Scrolls

1Q14 353n6
1Q15 353n6
1QJudg 252
1QSam 252
2QRuth 253
4Q106 253n6
4Q175 253
4Q161–165 253n6
4Q167–170 253n6
4Q182 253n6
4Q379 253
4QJosh 252
4QJudg 252–253n7
4QKgs 253
4QRuth 253
4QSam 252
5QKgs 253
5QpMal 253n6
6QKgs 253
11QPs 252

Intertestamental literature

Testament of Job 244
38.7–8 264

Mishna

Aboth
1.1 199
b. Meg
9a–b 230n69
y. Meg.
1.1.4 230n69
Megillat Ta'anit
13 231n78
Soferim
1.7–8 231n78
Sefer Tora
1.8–9 231n78

Inscriptions

Adulis

OGIS 54.15 49n45
OGIS 54.20.4 53n64

Choix
23 60n95
25 58n86

CII
I.25 44n23

IC
I.22.4A.37–38 59n86
II.17.1.10 44n23
III.4.2–3 (Itanos) 47n36

IG
II 2.1024 47n37, 54n69
VII 223–224 130n56
XI 4.1127 58n86
XI 4.1130 60n95
XI 4.1303 (Delos) 59n87
XII 2.513 (Lesbos) 59n87
XII 3.331 (Thera) 54n69

XII.3.462 (Thera) 59n87
XII.3.1386 (Thera) 59n87
XII 3.1387–1388 (Thera) 54n69
XII.5.16 (Ios) 59n87
XII.5.264–266 (Paros) 59n87
XII.5.1061 (Keos) 47n35
XII.7.99 (Amorgos) 59n87
XII.7.263–264 (Minoa) 59n87
XII Suppl 156 (Thera) 59n87

IMilet
III 123 46n29
III 139A 46n2948n39, 55n73

OGIS 14 360
OGIS 22 54n69
OGIS 23 54n69
OGIS 26 58n86
OGIS 27 58n86
OGIS 29 54n69, 58n86
OGIS 31 402n92???
OGIS 33 54n69
OGIS 34 59n87, 402n90
OGIS 39 44
OGIS 44 47n36
OGIS 54 49n45, 53n64, 142, 154n18
OGIS 55 67n5, 88
OGIS 56.10–11 56n77
OGIS 62 408n111
OGIS 97.4–7 392n27???
OGIS 111 146n57, 397n56???
OGIS 228 54n69
OGIS 229 56n77
OGIS 724 54n69, 58n86
OGIS 1266 103–115

SEG
I 363 46n31, 61n96
I 370 58n86
IX 55 44n22
IX 112 44n23
XVII 639 61n96
XVIII 636 359n35
XVIII 657 394n45
XXIV 154 76
XXIV 1207 394n45
XXVI 1306 107
XXVII 806 114
XXVIII 60.25–36 55n73
XXIX 102 45n24, 48n40, 60n95
XXXI 477 369n89
XXXIV 756 51n52
XXXVI 1218 55n74
XXXVI 1220 54n69
XXXIX 1234 54n69
XXXIX 1426 59n91
XLV 997 51n52

Syll.[3]
314 354n4
374 76
390 46n30, 61n96
433 67
434–435 47n35, 57n82, 66, 101n72
390 55n73, 56n75

Papyri
P.Cairo Zen. 38n39, 46n31, 188, 370n94, 377n126, 397n57, 400n78, 404n96, 405–406
P.Col.Zen. 366n63, 368n72, 377n126, 378n130
P.Dem. Zeno 377n126
P.Eleph. 143n41, 395n51

P.Grad. 368n74, 380n141
P.Haun. 36n35, 376, 380n140, 383, 401n82
P.Hausw. 380n140
P.Heid. 399n71
P.Hib. 185–187, 190, 298, 398n61
P.Jena 189n24
P.Jum. 337, 340
P.Köln 32n18, 33n23, 187
P.Lon-Leid. 316n45, 337n138
P.MNA 326, 333
P.Oxy. 149, 231, 325, 363n63, 366, 368n80
P.Petr. 189
P.Phrur.Diosk. 188n18
P.Rainer 239
P.Rev. 32n19
PSI 370n94, 378n130, 391n20, 405n101, 406n108
P.Sorb. 378n130
P.Stras. 368n75, 380n140
P.Tebt. 36n35, 40n4, 395n51
P.West. 304n3, 311, 315
P.Zen.Pestm. 32n17, 33n27, 34n28, 378n130